DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 379	CE 024 970

AUTHOR	Drewes, Donald W.
TITLE	The Context of Vocational Education--CETA Coordination: A State of the Art Report, Volume III. Interim Report.
INSTITUTION	Conserva, Inc., Raleigh, N.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	498AH80004
PUB DATE	Jan 80
CONTRACT	300-78-0583
NOTE	112p.; For related documents see ED 181 301 and CE 024 967-971.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Coordination; Demonstration Programs; *Employment Programs; Federal Programs; *Influences; Methods; *Program Effectiveness; Program Improvement; School Business Relationship; *Vocational Education; Youth Employment; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Title IV; *Prime Sponsors

ABSTRACT

This document is the third volume of a three-volume state-of-the-art report based on a study conducted to identify and analyze the effective mechanisms for facilitating coordination of vocational education programs with Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) Title IV youth programs. Included in this volume is an analysis of the contextual factors and forces that impinge upon the genesis and evolution of cooperative mechanisms. The objective of this report is to identify major contextual forces, to trace their impact on coordination, and to offer recommendations for the strengthening of those with positive impact and for the neutralization of those with negative influence. The introduction found in chapter 1 presents background information on the study. The second chapter discusses major historical factors influencing the development of coordinative mechanisms. In chapter 3, structures and processes impacting on vocational education are examined in terms of their impact upon coordination. The analysis presented in chapter 4 examines the structures and processes impacting on CETA prime sponsors in terms of their effect upon coordination. Finally, chapter 5 presents recommendations that will increase the likelihood of coordination effort between vocational education and CETA. (BM)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

ED185379

Interim Report

Project No. 498AH 80004

Contract No. 300780583

The Context of Vocational Education-CETA

Coordination:

A State of the Art Report

Volume III

Donald W. Drewes

CONSERVA, INC.

Raleigh, North Carolina

January, 1980

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education

CE 024 970

Material contained in this publication is in the public domain and may be reproduced fully or partially without permission of the Federal Government. Source credit is requested but not required. Permission is required only to reproduce any copyrighted material contained herein.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

  Coordination--A National Mandate 1

    Vocational Education/CETA Coordination 1

  The Vocational Education/CETA Linkage Project--An Overview 4

    Project Methodology 4

    Project Products 5

  Purpose and Organization (Volume 2) 6

    Definition of Coordination 6

    Purpose 8

    Organization 8

II. A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE 9

  The Need for a Developing Work Force 9

    The Formative Years 9

    The Beginning of Vocational Education 12

    The Emerging Era 13

  A Growing Concern for the Development of Human Resources 15

    Early Efforts 15

    Social Concern in the 60's 17

    National Manpower Programs 18

    The War on Poverty 20

    Removal of Barriers to Employment 22

  Career Education - An Emerging Educational Reform Movement 25

    Early Foundations 25

    Career Education Models 26

    Occupational Clusters 29

    Definitional Problems 30

    Career Education and Vocational Education . . 31

    Congressional Support 32

Page

The New Federalism 34
  Early Efforts at a Comprehensive Approach . . 35
  CETA--An Experiment in Decentralization . . . 37
  A Contradiction of Purpose 39
  The Changing Role of State Education Agencies 40
  Programmatic Changes at the Local Level . . . 41
  Public Service Employment 42
  Youth Legislation 43
  CETA Reauthorization 44
  Impact on Vocational Education 46
Notes 48
III. COORDINATION--THE EDUCATION SIDE 50
Vocational Education--A Structural Analysis . . 50
  Vocational Education as a Part of Academic/General Education 50
  Vocational Education Organization 52
  Local Organization 53
  The Impact of Educational Financing 55
  Matching and Maintenance of Effort 56
Vocational Education and the Disadvantaged . . . 58
  Definitional Differences 58
  Set-asides as a Targeting Strategy 59
  Ability of Federal Funds to Target State and Local Resources 61
  The Effects of Accountability 62
Vocational Education/CETA Coordination--The State of the Practice 63
  Summary Results 63
  Work Experience--The Prevailing Delivery Mode 64
  Awarding of Academic Credit 65
  Limited Emphasis on Placement 66
  Lack of Funds for Program Support 67
  Explanation of Results 67

Page

Autonomy of Observed Programs 68
Lack of Vocational Education Involvement . . . 69
Conclusions 71
IV. COORDINATION--THE PRIME SPONSOR 75
Administration 75
Programmatic Structure 75
Personnel 76
Program Planning 76
A Monitoring and Compliance Orientation . . . 78
The Role of the State 80
Prime Sponsor Philosophy 81
Choice in Selection of Program Deliverers . . 81
V. SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS 83
Congress 83
Department of Education 96
Department of Labor 99
State Responsibilities 103
Local Education Agencies and Prime Sponsors . . 104
REFERENCES 106

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

COORDINATION--A NATIONAL MANDATE

The continued specter of youth unemployment and the press for consolidation inherent in the New Federalism has resulted in a mandate for collaboration in the delivery of education and employment and training services to youth. Congress, in an effort to promote cooperation between local education agencies and prime sponsors, enacted the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977 (YEDPA). This Act, now incorporated as Title IV in the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) as amended, has as its purpose

> . . . to provide a broad range of coordinated employment and training programs for eligible youth in order to provide effectively for comprehensive employment and training services to improve their future employability, and to explore and experiment with alternative methods for accomplishing such purposes. [Sec. 401]

As a means of ensuring coordination, YEDPA requires that at least 22 percent of the funds available to prime sponsors under the Act for Youth Employment and Training Programs be spent under contract with local educational agencies. The Act mandates that in-school youth be provided work experience in combination with career counseling, occupational information, placement assistance and special efforts to overcome sex stereotyping.

Vocational Education/CETA Coordination

While not mentioned specifically in YEDPA, there is clear evidence of congressional intent to define coordination so as to include vocational education. Congress, in amending the Vocational Education Act of 1963, declared the purpose to be

> . . . to assist States in improving planning in the use of all resources available to them for vocational education and manpower training. . . . [P.L. 94-482, Sec. 101]

The Amendments further require that all eligible recipients desiring funding under the Act show that a coordinative approach is being followed to meet the vocational education and training needs of the area or community served [Sec. 106 (A)(4)(C)]; that a representative from the State Manpower Services Council participate in the preparation of the five-year State plans [Sec. 107 (A)(1)(H)]; that the five-year State plan contain criteria for coordinating Manpower Training Programs sponsored by CETA funds with vocational education programs supported by Federal assistance [Sec. 107 (B)(5)]; that the annual accountability reports show the results achieved by coordination of vocational education programs supported by Federal funds with Manpower and Training Programs funded under CETA [Sec. 108 (B)(1)(C)(i)]; and that the State Advisory Council on vocational education and the State Employment and Training Council share reciprocal membership [Sec. 105 (A)].

While not as explicit with reference to vocational education, the purpose of CETA as amended is

> . . . to provide for the maximum feasible coordination of plans, programs, and activities under this act with economic development, community development and related activities such as vocational education, vocational rehabilitation, public assistance, self-employment, training and social service programs. [P.L. 95-524, Sec. 2]

In specific recognition of the role of vocational education, the Act provides that 6 percent of the funds available under Parts A, B, and C of Title II be made available to support grants for supplementary vocational education assistance.

The role of vocational education in the preparation of people for work has been recognized by Ernest Green, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Employment and Training. In his keynote address to the 71st Annual Vocational Education Convention, Green stated,

> What is needed now in the CETA/Vocational Education relationship is for us to give more substance to its emerging form. By intensifying our teamwork we can play a key role in making sure that America's young people will be better prepared to face the job market and that the job market will be better prepared to accommodate them. (American Vocational Journal, February 1978, p. 24)

In recognition of the coordinative role of vocational education, the Department of Labor undertook to analyze the relationship between vocational education and prime sponsors and to determine what was working or could work. The Office of Youth Programs funded several national organizations including the American Vocational Association and the U.S. Conference of Mayors to look at vocational education/CETA coordination. In a national effort to promote coordination, YETP funds were matched with vocational education discretionary funds to support demonstration models of linkages between vocational education and CETA youth programs at both State and local levels. Demonstration programs proven to be effective are to be expanded and extended through dissemination of notable project findings. As a further cooperative initiative, the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, with funds provided by the Department of Labor, granted Summer Youth Employment monies to postsecondary institutions in an effort to test the effectiveness of involving minority disadvantaged youth in an integrated program of career development, basic skills development and vocational training.

Acknowledging the importance of increased coordination between vocational education and employment and training providers, the U.S. Office of Education awarded a contract to CONSERVA, Inc. to document and disseminate information on effective mechanisms for facilitating the coordination of vocational education programs between local education agencies and YEDPA prime sponsors. This study, hereafter referred to as the Vocational Education/CETA Linkage Project, is the first nationwide study to address directly the critical institutional interface between vocational education and YEDPA prime sponsors.

THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION/CETA LINKAGE PROJECT--AN OVERVIEW

Project Methodology

The Vocational Education/CETA Linkage Project is committed to the following goals:

- to describe the state of the art in vocational education-YEDPA linkages;
- to identify those contextual factors that influence the development of innovative mechanisms for facilitating coordination;
- to disseminate information on the joint efforts of vocational educators and prime sponsors;
- to promote a more unified approach in meeting the employability needs of youth.

As a means of documenting the state of the art, exemplary instances of coordination were identified through a nomination process. Representatives of the education and employment and training communities at the National, regional, and State levels were contacted and requested to nominate those programs considered to contain exemplary mechanisms for facilitating coordination between vocational education and YEDPA prime sponsors. A note of caution is in order regarding the nomination procedure used. Because the nomination procedures do not constitute a random sampling procedure, generalization to the population of all coordinative programmatic efforts between vocational education and YEDPA prime sponsors does not directly follow. What the procedure does, however, is to identify a sample of programs that have gained sufficient visibility to be regarded as models worthy of further investigation.

Contacts were initiated with each program nominated for the purposes of screening nominations and/or obtaining additional programmatic information. Each program nominated was screened to determine whether the program had a vocational orientation and if the program was funded at least in part from YEDPA funds. A program narrative was prepared for each program meeting these selection criteria. These program narratives were reviewed and 28 were selected for further in-depth site visitation. Case study narratives were prepared for each of the sites visited.

Data contained in the project narrations and case study reports provided the basis for the documentation of field-tested approaches to achieving coordination between vocational education and prime sponsors and for the analysis of those contextual factors influencing the extent and kind of coordination exhibited. Descriptions of exemplary programs and cooperative mechanisms, together with an analysis of the factors contributing to their success, are presented in a three-volume state-of-the-art report. Volume I contains programmatic abstracts of 111 nominated programs. Volume II contains an analysis of the contextual factors that either facilitate or inhibit the development of cooperative linkages. Volume III focuses on the generic mechanisms of coordination and provides a synthesis of mechanisms for coordination classified by functional program areas.

Project Products

The final products of the project will be a coordination handbook and an accompanying audiovisual presentation. The purpose of the handbook will be to provide procedural guides for assisting users in designing and implementing innovative approaches for facilitating coordination of vocational education programs between local education agencies and YEDPA prime sponsors. The audiovisual presentation will be directed at increasing awareness of the role of vocational education in youth employment and training and introducing the handbook to potential users. Project results are to be disseminated at two three-day workshops. These workshops will provide professional educators and prime sponsors an opportunity to review project findings and to discuss issues, problems, and experiences of mutual concern. The coordination handbook and state-of-the-art report will be nationally disseminated on a cost recovery basis.

PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION (VOLUME 2)

Definition of Coordination

The purpose of this volume is to explore the context in which vocational education/CETA coordination occurs. In order to do this, however, it is first necessary to consider briefly what is meant by coordination. Webster defines coordination as "the act or action of coordinating *or* the state of being coordinated" (Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, 1979).

These definitional components, while appearing similar, contain subtle distinctions. Defining coordination as the action of coordinating focuses on the acts by which coordination takes place; e.g., talking, meeting, sharing. In contrast, defining coordination as a state of being coordinated focuses on the structural properties contributing to coordination. Each definitional choice thus has its logical implications. An action-oriented definition leads to a description of coordination in terms of a series of common actions. A conceptualization of coordination as a 'state of being' shifts consideration from those actions that manifest coordination to the causes that contribute to the willingness to act together in a concerted manner.

Because of the interest in explaining the factors that contribute to coordination, coordination is herein defined as a state of alignment between two or more organizations. Organizations are said to be aligned when their policies, methods, procedures and techniques contribute to the attainment of a common purpose are termed coordinative mechanisms.

The implications of these definitions for vocational education/CETA coordination follow directly. The common purpose shared by both vocational education and CETA prime sponsors is the provision of education-to-work transition services to disadvantaged youth. Vocational education and CETA prime sponsors are said to be in a state of alignment when mechanisms exist for the provision of concerted services to disadvantaged youth. These mechanisms are represented by the organizational philosophies, policies, methods, procedures and techniques that provide the guidance of and the means for an exercise of concerted action.

Coordinative mechanisms defined in this sense are to be distinguished from organizational linkages. Whereas organizational linkages such as joint representation on planning and advisory councils and sharing of personnel are channels for interorganizational communication and most certainly qualify as coordinative mechanisms, not all coordinative mechanisms qualify as organizational linkages. Suppose, for example, that vocational education establishes a youth entrepreneurial program for disadvantaged youth. Since this program serves the common purpose of providing transitional services to disadvantaged youth, it is a coordinative mechanism, even though per se it does not represent an organizational linkage. Extending the definition beyond organizational linkages allows for greater scope and flexibility in the analysis of coordination and the contextual factors that contribute to its evolution. This is in no way meant to imply that organizational linkages are not important, but rather that the methods and means of coordination include and extend beyond the mere joint sharing of informational and physical resources.

Purpose

The purpose of this report, then, is to analyze those contextual factors and forces that impinge upon the genesis and evolution of cooperative mechanisms. This analysis includes both those forces and factors that impede the growth and development of coordinative mechanisms as well as those that facilitate their growth and development. These forces and factors, both positive and negative, when taken in total, constitute the contextual climate of coordination. This climate can either be detrimental, indifferent or supportive of the growth and development of coordinative mechanisms. The objective of this report is to identify major contextual forces, to trace their impact on coordination and to offer recommendations for the strengthening of those with positive impact and for the neutralization of those with negative influence.

Organization

In order to accomplish this objective, the report will be divided into five major chapters. Chapter II will deal with the major historical factors influencing the development of coordinative mechanisms. In Chapter III, structures and processes impacting on vocational education will be examined in terms of their impact upon coordination. In Chapter IV, the analysis will shift to CETA prime sponsors in an effort to identify the contextual influences facilitating and/or inhibiting coordination. Finally, Chapter V will present recommendations that hopefully will increase the likelihood of coordinative effort between vocational education and CETA.

CHAPTER II

A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Present coordination between vocational education and CETA prime sponsors has been strongly influenced by the interplay of historical forces. To understand the effects of this interplay requires that the major historical forces be identified and their interactive effects examined. Consistent with these demands, this chapter will be divided according to the major historical forces that have influenced the present status of coordination. Within each section, the discussion will be developed according to a chronological sequence of events.

THE NEED FOR A DEVELOPING WORK FORCE[1]

The Formative Years

Two forces--the Industrial Revolution and the expanding frontier--operated in tandem to create an insatiable appetite for skilled manpower. Exploding technology created a myriad of jobs heretofore unknown. Skills that were sufficient in an older day no longer were salable in a market that required ready acquiescence to new ways. The 'pull' of the frontier with the common perception of "opportunity for the taking" contributed to the growing need for a skilled work force to fill the rapidly expanding industrial economy. The westward migration created a continuing turnover in the industrialized work force, thereby creating a steady need for replacements. Vacancies created by the seductive lure of the West were filled by successive waves of immigrants hoping to move to a land of new opportunities. The westward moving frontier also served as a safety valve--a vent for social pressures created by the growing pains of an emerging industrial power. Those who were displaced by the industrial revolution moved West to seek their fortunes under new and unknown conditions.

As production moved from the loft to the factory, apprenticeship, as an early means of providing a pathway to literacy for those in colonial America who could not pay for an education, began to falter. Its importance declined due to the pull of the frontier, the individualism of the American pioneer, the increasing supply of skilled immigrants and the emergence of the factory system with its demand for skilled manpower beyond that which the apprenticeship system was able to produce. As a reaction to diminished educational opportunities for factory workers, numerous privately supported lyceums and institutions were founded wherein science was combined with practice in an effort to meet the educational needs of the mechanics and farmers. By the time of the Civil War, the manual labor movement had run its course, leaving as its legacy a social concern for the education of women and a fertile climate for the subsequent development of agricultural and industrial education.

Increasing interest in agricultural and industrial education resulted in the passage of the Morrill Act of 1862. This Act provided that each State was to receive a grant of land from which the interest from the sale was to be used to support and maintain at least one college devoted to agricultural and mechanical arts. States which accepted the grant were required to provide at least one agricultural and mechanical college within five years or the grant would be revoked. Since funds could not be used for buildings, the Morrill Act effectively established the precedent for the matching requirement in Federal assistance to education. The Act also marked the first attempt by Congress to use Federal support for education as an incentive to the States to attain a specific national goal.

In the period following the Civil War, considerable support developed for the establishment of free secondary schools supported by public taxation and controlled by the local community. The legality of local autonomy was contested for a quarter century and was not resolved until the Michigan Supreme Court affirmed the right of a local school board to levy taxes for the support of public education. This decision authorized local school boards to establish public secondary schools in response to public need and predestined vocational education's place in the public high school.

With the advent of improved techniques for training in the use of tools, a movement began to introduce manual training into the public schools. It was based on the premise that manual skills combined with liberal education enhance educational returns. The manual training movement was paralleled by developments in home economics and agricultural education. By the turn of the century domestic science had been incorporated into the public school curriculum. National legislation creating a network of agricultural extension centers at the local level focused attention on the need for improved agricultural practices and contributed to the development of agricultural instruction in the local public secondary schools.

The general educational focus of the manual training movement led to a paradox with respect to trade training. Whereas the shop and factory could not function as a school, neither could the school successfully duplicate the conditions of the trade. In an effort to develop a workable system of industrial education, the trade school emerged. These schools took a variety of forms. Some were private tuition schools; others were free. Many were operated by private employers as a means of providing their employees with the general educational foundation to support further skills development. Massachusetts took an early interest in trade schools and in 1906 passed a law making industrial education a part of the public school offerings. This action, together with widespread public interest, led to the foundation of a national society to promote the values of education as a preparation for industrial employment and to seek Federal support for industrial education.

The Beginning of Vocational Education

In response to a growing social demand for education to assume the responsibility for the development of the skilled work force, Congress passed the Smith-Hughes Act which established the precedent for Federal participation in secondary education. Heretofore the Federal government had supported agricultural and industrial education in land-grant colleges. The Smith-Hughes Act extended Federal aid to the public secondary schools by providing funds for the support of training in agriculture, home economics, trades and industries and in the preparation for teachers in these fields. Funds were authorized for salaries of teachers and supervisors in the public schools, administrative personnel, State Department of Education agency staff and teacher training personnel in colleges. States that accepted Federal support were required to designate a State board for vocational education and to submit a plan governing the expenditure of Federal funds. States receiving Federal funds were required to match the Federal appropriations which were allocated to States on a population basis. Thus, the Smith-Hughes Act laid the foundation for the present structure of vocational education.

The period from the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act to the mid-1960s marked the emergence of vocational education as a national response to the needs of those heretofore ignored by the educational system. Congress, in a series of subsequent acts, expanded the support and extended the scope of vocational education. The George-Dean Act of 1936 added distributive education and authorized increased appropriations to meet the growing vocational education need. World War II provided the nation a practical demonstration of vocational education's ability to train for war defense. In 1946, Congress passed the George-Barden Act to assist the nation's public schools in making a contribution to postwar recovery. This act increased the authorization, established practical nursing and fishing trades education as eligible for support and provided for increased flexibility of States' use of Federal funds. The designation of specific program areas eligible for support and the provision of assistance for teacher education of professionals in these programmatic areas created specialty areas within vocational education. These specialty areas demarked the content of vocational education and thus served as the basis for the creation of professional jurisdictional areas which were subsequently institutionalized in State educational organizational structure.

The Emerging Era

These programmatic funding categories remained until 1963 when Congress passed the Vocational Education Act. This Act eliminated the previously established programmatic categories and provided, instead, that Federal funds be used for providing services to designated target populations. Funds were authorized for construction of area vocational schools and for the use of program support services including in-service and pre-service teacher training and administration. A separate authorization was provided for the establishment of a work-study program to assist States in providing part-time public employment for needy students and for the construction of residential schools.

The Vocational Education Act was amended in 1968. Among other things, the Amendments provided for separate categorical authorizations for exemplary programs and projects, residential vocational schools, homemaking and consumer education and cooperative vocational education programs wherein meaningful on-site work experiences could be integrated with formal classroom studies. In addition, work study programs to provide part-time student employment were authorized as were curriculum development and bilingual vocational training. The definition of vocational education was expanded to include preparation for all occupations not considered professional and requiring less than a baccalaureate or higher degree for entry.

Considering the assigned responsibility to provide a supply of trained workers to meet the demands of an industrialized society, it is not surprising that planning was emphasized as the means to ensure an adequate supply of skills to meet employment demands. The Smith-Hughes Act, the founding legislation for Vocational Education, required that States desiring to receive Federal support submit a plan governing the proposed expenditure of Federal funds. The governing principle was that vocational education should train people for gainful employment and that training should be provided in those jobs most needed to support industrial growth. States in the preparation of their State plans were enjoined by the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to give due consideration to projected manpower needs and job opportunities in allocating Federal funds to local education agencies. The 1968 Amendments expanded the planning mandate by requiring a five-year and an annual plan for the expenditure of Federal funds. The requirement to consider current and projected manpower needs and job opportunities in their planning was extended to include new and emerging needs and opportunities at the local, State and National levels. State Advisory Councils were created and mandated to assist in the preparation of long-range and annual program plans.

The press for planning reached new levels in the Educational Amendments of 1976. Title II amended the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and took as its purpose to assist States in improving planning for the coordinated use of all resources. States in preparing their five-year plans were required to assess the current and future needs for job skills and to set out explicitly the goals the State would seek to achieve in meeting the assessed needs for the provision of these skills. To provide better demand-supply data on which to base decisions, a National Occupational Information

Coordinating Committee was established and mandated to develop an occupational informational system to meet the informational needs at National, State and local levels. Congress also provided for the establishment of a vocational education data system to allow for improved reporting and accounting of vocational education students, staff and expenditures.

Thus has vocational education since its early inception been assigned the role of developing people as economic resources. In this role, students are encouraged to develop skills which are or will be in demand by society, thereby ensuring them of employment upon completion of a program. Responsiveness of the educational system to economic requirements is to be ensured through reliance on the allocative efficiencies of rational planning supported by improved data reporting and accounting systems. The primacy of this role, however, is blurred by other contravening historical forces. One such force is the growing tendency to view humans as free agents who should be provided the opportunity to explore and achieve their fullest potential. This contrasts with their consideration as factors of production to be allocated by the laws of supply and demand in a manner that will promote economic and social growth.

A GROWING CONCERN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES[2]

Early Efforts

Co-existent with the emergence of an industrial society was a growing dissatisfaction with the inequalities in the distribution of economic and social opportunities. The laissez-faire doctrine of the 18th and 19th centuries was progressively displaced as the Federal government sought to achieve solutions to persistent social problems. Abolition of slavery, abolishment of child labor, guarantee of fair wages and standards, health and safety protection, collective bargaining--all became possible under the aegis of Federal welfare legislation. Passage of legislation to deal with the unique problems of special groups became a hallmark of the American legislative process. In quick succession after the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, Congress passed the Smith-Sears Act of 1918 and the Smith-Fess Act of 1920, which established the basis for a Federal-State partnership to provide physically disabled citizens with vocational guidance, training, occupational adjustment, prosthesis and placement services.

The necessity for economic recovery from the massive unemployment experienced in the Great Depression, coupled with the progressiveness of the Roosevelt New Deal, spawned a host of major social legislation. In 1933, the Wagner-Peyser Act heralded the beginning of the Employment Service. This Act called upon the States to establish an employment system to assist people in finding jobs and provided Federal funds as an incentive for States to establish these services. The Social Security Act passed by the Congress in 1935 provided that each State administer a system of unemployment insurance compensation according to standards established by the Federal government and assigned administration of the unemployment insurance to the Employment Service. The Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) was established during this period and provided an opportunity for enrollees to participate in the job-oriented education classes. The National Youth Administration (NYA), one of the first programs to turn its attention to the special needs of youth, was concerned especially with the problem of youth unemployment and their need for job training and vocational guidance. The NYA early set out to assist youth in evaluating themselves, to make vocational choices and to plan training programs that would be congruent with these choices. The National Apprenticeship (Fitzgerald Act) of 1937 established the Department of Labor's entrance into the training field and provided an alternative to manpower training through the public school system. With few exceptions, however, Federal response to the problems of unemployment were confined primarily to the creation of jobs rather than the provision of training for jobs that did not exist. The economic recovery caused by World War II and the postwar boom provided little further incentive or serious national concern about the continued development of human resources.

Social Concern in the '60s

The beginning of the 1960s marked the advent of the Great Society with its crusade to eradicate poverty. A rocky economy, an unpopular war and a growing social concern for those who had been bypassed by the mainstream of society led to a host of legislation aimed at equalizing social opportunities. In recognition of the rights of all individuals to share in the benefits of a democratic society, the purpose of vocational education shifted from the preparation for gainful employment to the provision of ready access of all people in all communities to quality vocational education which is realistic in terms of employment opportunities and suited to the needs, interests and abilities of people to benefit from such training. To promote these goals, Congress provided that Federal funds could be used to support work-study programs, residential schools, area vocational education programs and general education to the extent that it is related to the students' need for occupational training. Counseling and guidance services were to be provided to those students enrolled in vocational courses or those planning to enroll. To ensure that vocational education would be provided to those in need, Congress specifically identified four special populations for targeting of Federal funds:

1. those in secondary schools;
2. those who wanted to extend their vocational training beyond the secondary schools;
3. those already in the labor market and needing additional skills upgrading;

4. those who have academic, social, economic or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in a regular program.

By extending vocational education's responsibility to include student need as well as employment requirements, Congress made clear its intent that vocational education should function as an instrument of social change. The requirement that vocational education serve both the demands of the society for trained manpower and the needs of its citizens for productive and rewarding work created a contradiction in purposes and a fragmentation of the founding philosophy that had directed vocational education for nearly a half century.

National Manpower Programs

At about the same time, Congress turned its attention to dealing with the lingering problem of unemployment. As an adjunct to the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, Congress passed the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA). The purpose of this Act as originally conceived was to retrain adult workers who were unemployed because of technological obsolescence. Local employment offices were to identify demand occupations and to locate unemployed workers who could profit by retraining. Training was to be conducted by local public schools that were to be reimbursed for the use of their facilities. Funds for the classroom training component of MDTA flowed from the Federal government down through state educational agencies and state employment security agencies. State vocational educational agencies had full responsibility for selecting the training facilities and for administering the funds to local educational agencies. State employment security agencies through their local offices identified the occupations for which training was needed, performed the outreach activity to locate and recruit participants and attempted to place them upon completion of the program.

Funded classroom programs were generally of three types:

- single occupational training courses
- multi-occupational projects and
- individual referrals (Mirengoff and Rindler, 1978, p. 127)

Because of their congruence with regular vocational education programs, the most popular programs funded under MDTA were class-size courses dealing with particular skills or occupations. Since the time period of these courses did not correspond with the school time schedule, frequent problems were encountered in keeping the classes full due to their fixed entry-exit dates. As a means of serving MDTA clients, schools developed a self-contained organizational unit termed a skills center. These centers, not encumbered by the schedules of the regular school system, offered greater flexibility, open-entry and open-exit, and generally provided supportive counseling and guidance services. Depending on local circumstances, skill centers were under the jurisdiction of local school districts, public vocational education institutions or in some instances operated by private non-profit or community-based organizations. The third type of program funded was individual referral in which slots were purchased in ongoing programs on an individual-by-individual basis.

Thus, vocational education, as a skills provider, had been drawn into the battle against rising unemployment. The basic supposition guiding manpower policies in the early '60s was that sufficient jobs were available but that unemployment was caused by structural barriers. It was believed that these barriers could be removed by identifying the job skills in demand, by providing the unemployed with the requisite skills and by matching the supply of skilled workers with the jobs in demand. The failure of technological unemployment to materialize for adults with work experience and a 17% unemployment rate for youth in 1963 focused attention on the employment needs of the disadvantaged youth. MDTA was amended to provide increased training quotas to be made available to youth. The authorized training period was extended to 104 weeks. Basic education was allowed as a fundable activity and the amounts of basic training stipends were liberalized. Results, however, were disappointing. Although the overall unemployment rate fell, due largely to the effects of a tax reduction, unemployment for groups at a competitive disadvantage remained largely unaffected.

The War on Poverty

Coincident with Johnson's assumption of the Presidency, the impetus for manpower programs shifted to the Executive branch with the administration drafting battle plans for a war on poverty. In 1964, President Johnson signed the Economic Opportunities Act which created the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). The philosophy of the Act embodied in the programs it supported was geared to the removal of barriers inhibiting equality of economic opportunity. Attempts to improve equality of economic opportunities focused on the disadvantaged, especially youth. In recognition that self-attitudes, personal habits, emotional responses to life situations, and attitudes towards work were barriers affecting the employment of many disadvantaged, activities were designed to emphasize combination of remedial education training and work experiences. Supportive programs provided an extensive menu of human services including basic language and academic enrichment for the preschool child, part-time work opportunities for the adolescent who needed work to stay in school and employability skills for the out-of-school youth who needed altered attitudes and work habits to be better prepared to secure and hold a job. Programs oriented to serving the needs of youth included the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, VISTA, and special impact programs such as Headstart. For the older unskilled adult, developmental services were provided which included adult basic education, work experience programs and various types of special training.

Rather than enlisting the aid of established programs such as MDTA and Vocational Education in the War on Poverty, OEO chose to serve the poor through Community Action Programs which were often organized outside of the political and social infra-structure of the existing community. The Neighborhood Youth Corps sought to serve both in-school and out-of-school youth. In-school programs, offered by school districts or in community action agencies who matched Federal funds with in-kind facilities and services, were designed to provide youth with income and work experience. Out-of-school programs, offered by community action agencies or city and county governments, sought to provide income and employment for disadvantaged youth. The Job Corps, patterned after the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930s, was built on the philosophy that certain youths because of their extreme disadvantagements could not be served unless they were removed to a controlled environment. These Job Corps conservation centers were in essence vocational education residential schools. While espoused as being singularly different from vocational education schools, these centers employed similar instructors and curricula. Eligibility of private firms as operators of Job Corps Centers was regarded as a significant advantage.

Although choosing not to use MDTA as a direct vehicle, the antipoverty programs had a distinct gravitational pull. As the displacing effects of technology failed to materialize, emphasis shifted to those who were both unemployed and poor. Because of their early experiences in serving the skilled who were experiencing technological displacement, MDTA programs had difficulty shifting to serve the more disadvantaged. Those with higher levels of education were more than proportionately represented in institutional training. Recruitment procedures tended to favor the more experienced and highly motivated amongst the disadvantaged.

Employment security had little experience in identifying and motivating the more seriously disadvantaged to enroll in MDTA programs. Those who were motivated to seek out services by registering in employment security offices were not likely to be drawn from the pool of hard-core disadvantaged suffering from multiple labor market problems. Because of the demand for existing programs and the added expense imposed by augmenting training with supportive services, there was little incentive to engage in extensive outreach activities, nor to offer remedial program supportive services.

Evolution of the skills center concept represented a creative response to dealing with the problems of serving the disadvantaged. Separated from a regular educational institution, skills centers could deal with the whole person. Counseling, guidance, remedial education, employability skills and job skills could be creatively combined in a setting designed to emphasize a comprehensive learning experience. Skills centers, however, were not without their problems. In an effort to achieve training economies and placement efficiencies, high turnover occupations tended to be emphasized rather than those characterized by high demands. Facilities tended to be poor in comparison to regular vocational programs and less geared to the development of high-level skills. Perhaps most serious of all in an emerging era of equality, these programs treated the disadvantaged by withdrawing them from the mainstream of educational activity.

Removal of Barriers to Employment

Despite the combined efforts of OEO programs, MDTA and vocational education, poverty still persisted in the mid-60's. Despite a strong economy, there were still substantial pockets of poverty and accompanying high unemployment of specialized disadvantaged groups. Because of a demonstrated inability of manpower programs to eliminate these barriers by concentrating on raising the disadvantaged up, a new strategy emerged--that of attacking the barriers themselves. Thus, in a search for the ready solution, interest turned to intervention in the hiring process as a means of effecting a solution to persistent unemployment and poverty. A Concentrated Employment Program (CEP) represented a "rifle" approach to problems of unemployment in ghetto areas in which all existing manpower programs were coordinated in a specific target area and employers urged to hire the disadvantaged. Continuing the OEO penchant to circumvent the institutionalized entrance structure, Community Action Agencies were designated as the prime sponsor in each target city. Funds for the support of CEP came from MDTA, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and other OEO programs with more than half the monies coming from MDTA. In a further effort to interest employers in the hiring of the disadvantaged, job opportunities in the business center (JOBS) was initiated to be promoted by the National Alliance of Businessmen (NAB). The JOBS program relied upon a subsidy to employers as an incentive to hire the disadvantaged. Monies for the subsidies were obtained by reducing the funding for support of the classroom training component of the MDTA. In an effort to train more disadvantaged and to link them directly with potential employers, the goal of MDTA on-the-job training was increased from 25 percent to 50 percent of total MDTA enrollees.

This change in philosophies signaled the decline of classroom training as a significant manpower delivery system. The demands of the disadvantaged for immediate jobs had more political expediency than the claim that education was the passport from poverty. Jobs in the central cities were clustered at two extremes: those characterized as dead-end, with low wages and high turnover, and those requiring technical skills that could not be generally imparted within the time and resource constraints of most manpower programs. Manpower planners were thus in a quandary. They could either provide training for jobs in the secondary labor market that clients could generally get without the benefit of such training, or they could gear up to provide training for more technical jobs at a greater expenditure of resources, thereby serving fewer clientele. In view of the returns, the strategic decision was to emphasize those programs with short-run employment benefits to the disadvantaged. Congress continued to support MDTA with training being directed to be provided through skills centers and the concept of skills centers was expanded to community colleges. However, this support was not forthcoming in the appropriations. Absence of increased appropriations and diversion of funds to other programs decreed the decline of institutional skills training as a potent weapon in the continuing battle against unemployment.

While expressing only lukewarm support for skills training under the auspices of MDTA, Congress passed the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. The '68 Amendments reaffirmed the nation's commitment to provide quality vocational education to a larger segment of American society. Uses of Federal funds were expanded to include programs and services to the handicapped who could not succeed in regular classes and to those with limited English-speaking abilities. Vocational guidance and counseling was declared eligible for support and provisions were made for providing vocational training through arrangements with private institutions. To ensure that the needs of special groups were not overlooked, minimum percentage expenditure levels were established for the academically and socially disadvantaged, for the handicapped and for programs for youth and adults in postsecondary institutions.

Thus, the decade of the '60s closed with mixed optimism and a mosaic of programs designed to serve the disadvantaged. None of the approaches tried, however, have lived up to the initial optimism that improvement in the skills capabilities of humans would guarantee employment in a free society. Unemployment and poverty remain unequally distributed across the population despite the plethora of programmatic solutions. Contracts to dispense manpower services were said to be in excess of 10,000 (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, p. 182). Federal monitoring was shared by MDTA staff, Office of Economic Opportunities staff, Economic Development Administration staff, and the Department of Labor. Administration was hampered by conflicting jurisdictions, non-uniformity of reporting, duplication of services, territorial turfdom and agency reluctance to cooperate.

CAREER EDUCATION - AN EMERGING EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENT[3]

Career education is reported to have made its debut on the educational scene when in early 1971 then U.S. Commissioner of Education, Sidney Marland, gave his famous address entitled "Career Education Now" before the National Association of Secondary School Principals. In that address, Marland laid out the design for American education--a design in which every student would leave high school with a marketable skill. Schools would have the responsibility for 100 percent placement in either a job or continuing education. Curricula would emphasize the dignity of work, the relevance of education to a work career, and a design in which education extended beyond the school to encompass the community itself.

Early Foundations

Although focused by Marland into a new rubric, the concepts themselves were neither new nor novel. No lesser figure than Benjamin Franklin offered the view that education had utilitarian purposes in the development of a middle class and that certain selected subjects would lead to success in business and the professions (Herr, 1972). Organized labor took an early position that education should lead to improved understanding of the relationship between work and society. Frank Parsons in the early 1900s laid the groundwork for the modern counseling and guidance movement with his book, Choosing a Vocation. Parsons argued for an awareness of self, understanding of the requirements for success, and the use of reasoning to relate this information in an informed choice of vocations. The National Vocational Guidance Association, founded in 1913, argued that the school curriculum provides for the integration of vocational guidance and for skills development. This unity, however, was deferred for nearly a half century by the National Education Association's decision to emphasize guidance for education's sake rather than for orientation to work. The influential educational philosopher John Dewey argued in the 1930s that education should provide the means for developing the skills, knowledge and attitudes necessary for coping with the adjustment problems of life. Of specific relevance to career education, the most persistent life situations were defined as the wise use of leisure time and earning a living.

Interest in vocational guidance and career development continued but with little formal recognition and support until the advent of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. These Amendments provided that Federal vocational education funds could be expended for vocational counseling and guidance, and authorized expenditure of funds for exemplary programs and projects. Given the existence of long-standing support for the concept and the presence of Federal funds for support, Marland's speech galvanized the U.S. Office of Education into action. The Bureau of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education was directed to provide guidelines to the States to assist them in using funds for research, demonstration and exemplary projects to launch the career education movement. Two major strategies were followed by the Office of Education in guiding the development of career education exemplary and demonstration projects in the States.

Career Education Models

One strategy was the development of Federally sponsored models of career education. These models were to operationalize the concept of career education and represented the initial core of research and development efforts at the Federal level. Four models were eventually developed. They were:

- Model I: School-based Comprehensive Career Education Model (CCEM);
- Model II: Employer-based Career Education (EBCE), later retitled the Experience-based Career Education Model;
- Model III: Home-based Career Education; and
- Model IV: Rural-residential Career Education.

The school-based model provided a curricular system for restructuring the public school system. The model was structured around a three-staged approach to career development. In elementary grades, students increased their awareness of education and of the world of work by learning about a wide variety of work roles and the skills and requirements necessary to perform in these roles. In the middle grades, students were provided the opportunity to explore occupational clusters through classroom instruction in which the concept of career and work was infused in the educational experience through observation such as work role models, field trips and shadowing through actual hands-on work experience. In grades 11 and 12, students had an option to choose either intensive preparation for job entry, preparation for postsecondary education or preparation for four-year colleges. By providing each student with the comprehensive set of options, every student was expected to leave the system with an entry-level skill coupled with basic academic skills necessary to sustain further career progression and development. Over 1,000 goals were developed and assigned to each of the progressive stages of career development. These goals constituted the intellectual framework of the model and were used to classify existing curricular materials that could be used to achieve these goals.

The employer-based career education model was an attempt to serve teenagers through providing them with an optional out-of-school program. Individual learning elements were identified and matched with ideal or actual work experiences and opportunities in the community as means whereby the students could learn these competencies. Educational materials were tailored to student needs and teacher and counselor roles integrated with those of other adults in the community so as to allow the students to gain experience in a real adult-centered world. All community education activities were awarded credit, thereby insuring graduation and a choice of placement options upon graduation. Business and other community agencies provided the off-school site education and work opportunities with a learning coordinator and a community resource person working in conjunction with teachers and counselors to ensure that work experience was contributing to the educational development of the students.

The remaining models were more limited in their coverage. The home/community-based model sought to increase the employability of out-of-school adults through the use of mass media, referral centers, individual counseling and articulated use of community resources. The rural/residential based model was an effort to explore the feasibility of serving rural families through an intensive program at a residential school.

With the creation of the National Institute of Education in the Education Amendments of 1972, responsibility for the career education models was transferred from the Office of Education to the newly created National Institute of Education. In carrying out their mandated research function, the National Institute of Education set about to evaluate the career education models. The school-based model received considerable criticism ranging from lack of consideration of current theories and research in career development to a manpower bias with emphasis on the development of marketable skills rather than highest order of development of human potential. As a result, the school-based model was largely aborted and NIE's resources reallocated to a broad range of curricular and program development projects. The Employer-based Model, renamed the Experience-based Model by NIE, fared better. Positive evaluation results prompted efforts to disseminate the model to the States. The remaining two models have remained as largely research and development prototypes with limited dissemination of results.

Occupational Clusters

Whereas the career education models were initiated by OE and inherited by NIE, occupational clustering as the second major strategy has remained an OE initiative. Work on the formulation of the clusters was begun in the spring of 1971. As a result of work by the staff committees of the Division of Vocational and Technical Education and a review by the State Directors of Vocational Education, the Office of Education released a cluster scheme consisting of 15 career clusters. The clustering scheme was designed so that all the jobs in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles would be encompassed. Each cluster was to include jobs ranging from entry-level through skilled, technical and professional. Clusters were to be relatable to identifiable groups of employers and the clusters should be enduring over time.

Clusters were conceived so that a basic set of skills would be common to all occupations in that cluster. Thus, by learning those common skills students would be assured of having an entry-level skill with flexibility to move laterally across jobs in their cluster or up or down the career ladder of jobs within the cluster according to changes in personal goals and/or labor market conditions. The conceptualization of the application of these clusters was that students by being provided the opportunity to browse through the occupational clusters in the exploratory stages, would have reached a tentative decision on a cluster of interests by the end of the eighth grade. Grades 9 and 10 would provide the opportunity for more intensive exploration within the cluster and by the end of grade 10, a specific job within a cluster would have been chosen and educational curricular activities selected that would allow for either immediate employment upon graduation or the preparation for further skilled training at the postsecondary level. Students desiring employment immediately upon graduation could master the skills common to their cluster of interest and could augment these with specific job entry skills to be developed in a vocational program. Students desiring to pursue further education beyond graduation could supplement the common job skills with college preparatory and academic courses taken concurrently.

The cluster concept has initiated a variety of curriculum efforts at Federal, State and local levels. More than $10,000,000 has been invested by the Office of Education since 1971 in pursuing the development of cluster-based curricula. States such as Oregon, Texas, Arizona and California have either used the OE clusters or have refined them for their own use. Cities such as Dallas and Washington, D.C. have developed filmstrips and cassettes often in conjunction with commercial producers, for the provision of general career awareness for elementary and secondary schools, community colleges and adults.

Definitional Problems

Although when originally introduced the definition of career education was eschewed, the eventual need for concepts and definitions could not be avoided. One of the more influential definers of career education has been Kenneth B. Hoyt, Director of the Office of Career Education. Hoyt made the concept of work the cornerstone of his definition of career education. He conceived of work as conscious effort aimed at producing benefits for oneself and/or others; and, in an early definition, defined career education as the sum of all those activities and experiences through which one learns about work. His individually oriented definition was subsequently changed with career education being redefined as an effort to refocus American education around the global goal of education as preparation for work. NIE took a more employment-oriented approach wherein career education was equated with development of knowledge and abilities needed to advance in a job or series of jobs constituting a career.

In addition to definitions promulgated by the Federal government, numerous other agencies, professional associations and States have formulated their own definitions of career education. Each differs according to the emphasis placed on job, work, self or life as the major focus for career education. The National Advisory Council for Career Education, after examining numerous definitions and concepts of career education, concluded that hundreds of definitions exist varying in rationale, goals and focus. Definitions differ depending upon whether they emanated from vocational education, vocational guidance or from State and Federal education agencies. Definitions and concepts vary according to use with much confusion in career education terminology. However, there are common points of agreement as to what constitutes career education (1977). Agreement appears to abound in the principles that career education is for all students at all educational levels, that every person leaving the educational system should have job employability skills, that greater freedom of choice should be interjected into the educational system so that basic skills can be coordinated with developing individual preferences, that the educational system should be an open system, and that coordination between all elements of education as well as among school, industry and community is the necessity.

Career Education and Vocational Education

While there seems to be agreement about the necessity to diminish the separation between academic and vocational education, there is less agreement as to the corresponding roles of career and vocational education. Rupert Evans, in an early attempt to detail the similarities and contrasts between career education and vocational education, saw them as having precisely the same goals with career education subsuming vocational education as an indispensable part of the preparation phase. Ken Hoyt, in a later paper, termed vocational education the 'bedrock' for career education and urged that the professional vocational education communities support the career education movement. He likened vocational education to one of the parents of career education and argued that a reformed goal of education as preparation for work could not be achieved if the career education movement was controlled by vocational education (Hoyt, 1976). As Hoyt's thinking evolved, he came to see vocational education and career education as separate and distinct approaches to meeting the goal of education as preparation for work. This distinction may reflect Hoyt's recognition that career education as a reform movement must be differentiated from vocational education as a programmatic activity.

Regardless of admonitions to the contrary, career education has not escaped an association with vocational education. Critics have charged that career education is just another means of extending or expanding vocational education. This suspicion stems, in large part, from the use of vocational education monies under the '68 Amendments as seed money to initiate career education demonstration projects. The strong emphasis on paid work that pervades many definitions of career education and the fact that local education agencies have seen fit in many instances to administratively combine career and vocational education did little to assuage the concerns of the critics.

Congressional Support

Although career education had achieved the status of a national movement, Congress had remained silent. In the Education Amendments of 1974, Congress for the first time authorized monies to support career education activities.

Section 406 of the Act authorized funds for the development of information on the needs of career education, promotion of a national dialogue on career education so as to encourage States and locals to utilize the approach best suited to their needs, to assess the studies of career education programs and practices, to provide for the demonstration of the best of current practices and programs identified, and required that States and locals develop plans for the implementation of career education programs. Although not an authorization for a program of general assistance to career education, the Education Amendments of 1974 did provide funds for a thorough investigation of the efficacy of career education prior to making it a national priority.

In the Career Education Incentive Act of 1977, Congress declared it to be a national purpose of education to prepare every individual for a career suitable to that individual's preference. Congress decreed that career education should be a part of the nation's educational process which serves as preparation for work, that career education holds promise of improving the quality of education and opening career opportunities for all students and that educational agencies should work toward fulfilling the potential inherent in career education. Congress declared the purpose of the Act to be to assist States and local education agencies in increasing the emphasis of career awareness, exploration, decision making and planning in a manner that will promote equal opportunity in making career choices through the elimination of bias and stereotyping on account of race, sex, age, economic status or handicap. State educational agencies are to administer programs of career education assisted under this Act so as to ensure that they will affect all instructional programs in elementary and secondary education. Funds under the Act are authorized for use to provide State leadership for career education including such activities as engaging in cooperative relationships with other agencies in State government and other public agencies and private organizations and any business and industry collecting, evaluating and disseminating career education materials. Agreements are authorized through local education agencies for such purposes as the development and implementation of comprehensive career guidance counseling, placement and follow-up services, development and implementation of cooperative relationships at the local level with organizations representing handicapped and minority groups, developing and implementing work experiences for students whose primary purpose is career exploration, establishing an operating career educational resource center serving both, students and the general public. However, the promise inherent in the authorization failed to be matched by appropriations. Congress originally appropriated $32.5 million which was subsequently reduced to $20 million for fiscal year 1979. The level of support has little more than maintained career education at its present level, leaving its place in the sun yet to be determined.

Career education for minority and low-income persons has been characterized as one of "over-promise and under-delivery" (Hoyt, 1976). In an effort to document the problems inherent in serving disadvantaged youth, the Office of Education issued a contract to study the problems encountered in formulating the educational agreements governing the expenditure of the 22 percent set-aside in the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act. The study was to identify through a series of mini-conferences and State-conducted surveys the problems encountered in negotiating these agreements, to document exemplary strategies being used to overcome these problems and to recommend ways in which career education might better serve the needs of disadvantaged youth.

THE NEW FEDERALISM[4]

As the decade of the '60s drew to a close, Federal manpower programs represented a patchwork mosaic and a bureaucratic maze. Some 17 separate programs were authorized to offer manpower services, each with its own separate administration, rules and regulations and each striving to serve essentially the same constituency. As a result, manpower programs were characterized by the lack of a unified approach in the development of the priorities and the goals, inability to structure manpower programs to meet local needs, lack of coordination of program operators in administering to the needs of the disadvantaged, and an overall inability to assess the effectiveness of the programs. Community Action Agencies had bypassed established social institutions in their zeal to mobilize resources for the poor and to coordinate local antipoverty efforts. State agencies responsible for the administration of MDTA were largely beyond direct gubernatorial control.

Early Efforts at a Comprehensive Approach

Resistance to the strongly centralized and categorized approach was slowly mounting. In 1967, an effort was made to amend the Economic Opportunity Act so as to consolidate manpower programs under a single sponsor. In an effort to coordinate the projects funded under the MDTA program, the Department of Labor initiated a Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS). States were required to formulate local area committees which were to plan local programs to serve their areas. These jointly developed program plans were to be incorporated into State plans which were then to be submitted to the regional DOL office for approval. CAMPS committees were voluntary with no authority to enforce cooperation and coordination. Due to uncertainties as to the level of Federal funding and the extent of area jurisdiction, cooperative plans were little more than assemblages of local agency plans stapled together. Regional offices of the Department of Labor, having no administrative authority over HEW, OEO, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, did not know what to do with the plans. Although an exercise in cooperative planning that illustrated that agencies could work together in good faith, the CAMPS' efforts were largely ineffective in achieving a coordinative approach to the delivery of manpower services.

As efforts to overhaul the deficiencies of the system failed to deal with the problems, it became increasingly clear that a major structural revision was needed. Governors, irked at not having control over manpower policies and programs influencing their States, began to press for a greater voice. Large cities smarting under problems of unemployment sought to assert their rights to design programs tailored to meet their individual employment problems. Public interest groups sought to assert their rights to be the presumptive deliverers of services to minority and low-income groups.

The rising protests from the grass roots did not go unheeded. Beginning in 1969, a long series of debates was held over the form and substance of a new approach to the delivery of manpower services. As the debate waxed and waned, themes of decentralization and decategorization emerged as the shaping forces. Advocates argued that local communities were in the best position to ascertain their needs and to plan for the delivery of services to meet these needs. Decategorization was opposed by many of the agencies charged with the administration of services under centralized programs. The opponents were fearful that decategorization would upset the balance between States and locals and could represent a signal threat to the viability of the categorical grant recipient.

Further impetus was given to the decentralization thrust by the Nixon administration decision in 1971 to shift from categorized grants to a general revenue-sharing approach to Federal funding. With respect to manpower programs, this translated into putting all programs into one comprehensive package, the requirement being that cities and localities spend the money for manpower purposes. Dissatisfied with

Congressional failure to resolve the problem, the administration's version of manpower reform in a group of comprehensive manpower program pilot projects. These projects provided valuable experience and provided a continual reminder to Congress that a comprehensive approach based on revenue sharing was a workable solution. The strategy paid off with Congress enacting into law the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act in late 1973.

CETA--An Experiment in Decentralization

The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act had two strategic objectives--that of decentralization and decategorization of Federal manpower programs and the provision to local communities of the flexibility to plan and deliver manpower services suited to their localities. Responsibility for the planning and administration of manpower programs was assigned to local units of government as the prime sponsors. Restrictions on the use of funds were removed with prime sponsors given the freedom to design the basic mix of program services and delivery mechanisms best suited to their purposes. State agencies were largely bypassed with prime sponsors required to prepare and submit a plan to regional offices of the Department of Labor for approval.

The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) consisted of seven titles. Title I was the major decategorized title authorizing the prime sponsors to offer comprehensive services under a single block grant that combined the heretofore separate MDTA, EOA and EEA funding sources. Title I funds were allocated according to a formula that took into account prior years' apportionments, number of unemployed and the number of adults in low-income families. Prime sponsors were required to submit an acceptable plan prepared in consultation with local advisory councils. A State manpower services council was created to review local prime sponsor plans and to arrange for the cooperation of State agencies. Title II provided for funds to be expended for public service jobs in areas of substantial unemployment. Funds were allocated on a formula basis according to the proportionate share of total unemployment. Title III provided the authority for the national administration of programs for Indians, migrant and seasonal farmworkers, youth and other groups in particular need of such services. This title also gave the Secretary of Labor discretionary powers in the areas of research, evaluation, experimental and demonstration projects, labor market information and job banks. Title IV provided the authorization for the operation of the Job Corps residential training centers for disadvantaged young men and women. Title V established the National Commission for Manpower Policy wherein Title VI authorized public service jobs for the unemployed. Title VII was largely concerned with administrative provisions against discrimination and political activity.

The role of state agencies was substantially curtailed under CETA. The Act provided States no direct administrative authority or veto power over the action of local prime sponsors. The State was authorized to serve as a prime sponsor in those lightly populated areas termed the balance-of-state which, either because of failure to meet the population criteria or demonstrated lack of interest, failed to qualify as a prime sponsor. The only other direct funding for which the States qualified was ten percent set-aside of Title I funds. One percent of Title I funds was reserved for the support of state planning councils, four percent for the discretionary use of the governor, and five percent set-aside to be administered by the State Boards of Education under non-financial agreements with state educational agencies and prime sponsors. This represented a significant departure from MDTA days when state educational agencies played a significant role in the administration and control of manpower programs.

A Contradiction of Purpose

Considering the original concern for decategorization and decentralization, CETA represented a study in contradictions. Of the original four titles (three being added by subsequent amendments), only Title I represented a truly decategorized approach to the delivery of manpower services. Title II programs, while not categorical in the stricter sense, did limit expenditures to the provision of public service employment in areas of high unemployment. Title III provided for support for programs narrowly defined to serve specific target groups, while Title IV authorized continuation of the Job Corps for disadvantaged youth. Thus, only Title I gave unfettered freedom to prime sponsors to offer manpower programs of their choice. In this respect, CETA was only a quasi-decategorized program.

However, the decentralizing impact was more pronounced. Mirengoff and Rindler (1978) estimate that whereas only 42 percent of the total fiscal 1975 CETA resources were decategorized, 89 percent of the total resources were under the decentralized control of State and local government prime sponsors. The tendency to decentralize but to maintain categorical targeting of funds continued. In fiscal year 1976, 94 percent of total CETA funds were appropriated for decentralized programs, whereas only 28 percent of the fiscal 1976 appropriations went for decategorized programs (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978). As an indication of the targeting inherent in CETA, in excess of 70 percent of CETA appropriations for fiscal year 1976 were earmarked for special purposes or target groups. Title I, the only decategorized component, declined from accounting for 42 percent of the CETA appropriations in 1975 to only 23 percent by 1977 (Mirengoff and Rindler, 1978, p. 19). The obvious explanation is that whereas Congress transferred the administration of manpower programs to the local level, they were unwilling to give up the targeting of manpower funds to the discretion of local authorities.

The Changing Role of State Education Agencies

The advent of CETA required considerable realignment of the role of State educational agencies in the administration of manpower programs. Whereas State educational agencies played a major role under MDTA, their only explicit role under CETA was to administer vocational education services to be provided with prime sponsors through non-financial agreements. Early transition periods were marked by caution and confusion. The Act was vague on who should administer the 5 percent monies and how they should be used. The dispatch with which state educational agencies assumed the lead varied considerably. In some States, there was a great hesitancy and reluctance on the part of educators to take the initiative in the establishment of guidelines and in contacting prime sponsors. In other States, State CETA staffs and State Manpower Services Council personnel worked in close conjunction with State vocational education staff to develop guidelines for the use of the 5 percent monies.

Uncertainty, however, was not the sole property of education. Prime sponsors in many instances assumed unilateral responsibility for the preparation of plans only to find those plans not acceptable to State vocational education boards. Considerable delays were experienced in the transference of funds. Vocational education boards frequently denied use of CETA funds for trainee allowances since this use generally differed from the educational policy of not paying students for work experience. Prime sponsors were frequently not notified of the rules and restrictions constraining the preparation of plans for expenditure of the 5 percent monies. Prime sponsors frequently regarded the set-aside money as theirs and resisted any efforts by the State vocational education board to impose restraints on its use. As a result, many States delayed signing of their agreements which tended to inhibit any efforts to coordinate vocational education activities with Title I programs. Although procedures became more operational in subsequent years, disagreements remained over the utilization of funds, the specifics of the reporting and record keeping systems and the content and administration of programs. Whereas the existing arrangements had been most seriously disrupted at the State level, business more or less as usual tended to be descriptive of conditions at the local level.

Programmatic Changes at the Local Level

Transition was less abrupt at the local level. Over 70 percent of the operators of the Title I programs had operated manpower programs the previous year under categorical contracts (U.S. Department of Labor Interchange, 1975). What did change, however, was the role that prime sponsors now played in the management and administration of programs. In a study conducted by the U.S. Conference of Mayors in the fall of 1974, 83 percent of the prime sponsors surveyed indicated that the plan was to maintain or increase the level of classroom training in fiscal year 1975 as compared to pre-CETA funding. Only one out of six prime sponsors surveyed indicated that they planned to decrease the total level of funding for classroom training activities (National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors, 1974-1976). The Department of Labor reported that nearly two out of three prime sponsors surveyed reported that they either anticipated providing for the first time or increasing the amount of funding to local schools for the provision of classroom training work experiences and other supportive activities contrasted with only one out of six prime sponsors who indicated that they planned to reduce or eliminate local schools as a deliverer of manpower services (CETA Staff Evaluation findings, U.S. Department of Labor, July 1975). In an update of the previous results, the U.S. Conference of Mayors reported that in excess of 50 percent of prime sponsors surveyed reported more effective working relationships with vocational education during the fiscal year 1976 than previously.

The transition from the centrally administered categorical approach of the '60s to the decentralization of CETA did not produce abrupt discontinuities of service although expected qualitative changes did occur. Perhaps the greatest change in functional manpower activities was the decrease in classroom training. Categorical program expenditures for classroom training in fiscal year 1974 declined from 42 percent of Title I expenditures to less than 33 percent of anticipated Title I expenditures for fiscal year 1975. Significant changes in the comparison of participant characteristics signaled subtle changes in the service pattern. Services to youth declined from 63 percent in '74 to 56 percent in fiscal year '76. The educational level of the population served increased with those having twelve grades or more of education accounting for 45 percent of those served in '76 as opposed to only 33.8 percent in '74. The proportion of enrollees with 9-11th grade education fell from a little over half of those served in '74 to 43 percent of those served in 1976. Economically disadvantaged accounted for nearly seven out of every eight recipients of manpower services in 1974. Two years after the advent of CETA this ratio had fallen to three out of every four (CETA enrollees; U.S. Department of Labor Manpower Information Service).

Public Service Employment

As the CETA experiment unfolded, rising unemployment accompanied by a recessionary trend in the economy caused government policy makers to shift to public service employment as a strategy for dealing with the high levels of unemployment. In fiscal 1974, public service employment appropriations amounted to only 40 percent of the appropriations for employability development. By fiscal year 1978, this ratio had shown a dramatic reversal with public service employment appropriations outstripping employability development appropriations by nearly seven to one (based on data provided in Mirengoff and Rindler, 1978, p. 20). This emphasis on public service employment signaled a shift in CETA philosophy from earlier attempts to deal with the problems of structural unemployment by upgrading the skills of the human resources to dealing with the problem of lack of aggregate demands through the provision of jobs in the public sector. The emphasis on public service employment as a categorical program emphasized the reluctance of Federal policy makers to leave the solution of manpower problems to the discretion of local communities.

Youth Legislation

With the passage of the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977 (YEDPA), Congress added yet another categorical program to the CETA structure. This Act later designated as Title IV of CETA recognized the lingering crisis of youth unemployment, the limited role being played by the public school system and the unintended effect of CETA programs as a disincentive for disadvantaged youth to stay in school. The purpose of YEDPA was two-fold: (1) to provide for a comprehensive approach to the provision of comprehensive employment and training services to improve the employability of youths, and (2) to support research and development to ascertain and evaluate the effectiveness of various strategies for achieving improved employability.

Various employment and training approaches coupled with demonstration projects to test new ideas were authorized. The youth incentive entitlement projects provided funds to selected prime sponsors to experiment with programs that provided for employment guarantees for disadvantaged youths to return to school or maintain enrollment in schools. Funds were made available for youth community conservation and improvement projects as a vehicle for providing employment, work experience skills and skills training, while at the same time engaging in conservation and beautification projects of utilitarian value to the community. Prime sponsors were authorized to provide appropriate training and support services including outreach, assessment and orientation; counseling; provision of labor market information; development of job search skills; literary and bilingual training; vocational exploration; remedial education; institutional and on-the-job training; transportation assistance; and child care, as well as job development, direct placement and other programs designed to improve the labor force participation of disadvantaged youths. In recognition of the problems of in-school youths and the necessity for schools to address the needs of these youths, Congress provided that at least 22 percent of the funds available to prime sponsors for the support of youth employment and training programs be expended by local educational agencies under agreement with prime sponsors. Thus, for the first time, prime sponsors were mandated to deal directly with local public schools. Additional authorizations gave the Secretary of Labor discretionary funds to carry out innovative and experimental programs, established a Job Corps for economically disadvantaged young men and women and incorporated provisions for summer youth programs.

CETA Reauthorization

As experience with CETA programs under local control accumulated, dissatisfaction heightened in several areas. Reports of mismanagement and misdirection of CETA efforts caused Congress to become increasingly critical of the management of CETA programs. The wisdom of the shifting emphasis from human resource development to public service employment came increasingly under question with many believing that the program represented undue Federal intervention and an attempt to alleviate unemployment by the creation of meaningless make-work activities rather than the stimulation of demand in the private sector.

These criticisms culminated in the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments of 1978. These Amendments provided for more stringent monitoring and reporting of prime sponsor activities, strengthened the technical assistance role of the Department of Labor and redirected the public service employment thrust. Public service employment was divided into two uses: to promote transitional employment to enable the disadvantaged to move into unsubsidized employment and as a countercyclical measure. countercyclical use of public employment funds was controlled by a trigger function linked with unemployment rate. By limiting the use of public service employment, the intent was to return to the original philosophy of the development of employability skills as the major mode of dealing with the problem of unemployment. Eligibility requirements were tightened to ensure that CETA targeted more directly on the needs of the economically disadvantaged--again a move to return CETA to the original concerns of the pre-CETA manpower programs.

The amended CETA maintained the same number of titles but with a restructuring of the ordering and contents. Administrative provisions which under the old CETA had been Title VI now became Title I. Title I activities were reauthorized as Title II which provided for services to economically disadvantaged, upgrading and retraining and the use of public service employment to provide transitional employment opportunities. The special set-aside for vocational education was increased from 5 percent to 6 percent with up to 15 percent of that amount authorized to be used to promote coordination with existing vocational education programs, to develop linkages between vocational education and prime sponsors and to provide technical assistance to vocational education institutions and local educational agencies in establishing cooperative relationships with prime sponsors. The importance of coordination was further emphasized by the establishment of a 1 percent set-aside to be used specifically for encouraging coordination and developing linkages between prime sponsors and educational institutions and agencies and in the support of services jointly delivered by employment and training agencies and appropriate educational agencies and institutions. As before, Title III dealt with special Federal responsibilities involved in the initiation and administration of special national programs and activities and in the conduct of research, training and evaluation. The youth title was designated as Title IV and incorporated the sections under YEDPA. Title V continued the authorization for a National Commission for Employment Policy. Title VI authorized public service jobs for the unemployed to be used as a countercyclical measure linked to the national unemployment rate. Title VII contained a new thrust designed to involve the private sector in the provision of opportunities for the economically disadvantaged. As in the initial CETA, Title VIII contained the authorization for a Young Adult Conservation Corps to be involved in projects on public lands.

Impact on Vocational Education

The New Federalism also left its imprint on vocational education legislation. In the Education Amendments of 1976-Title II, Congress provided for a separate authorization in the form of a basic grant to the States which represented the decategorization of programs separately funded under the '68 Vocational Education Amendments. To ensure that supportive services would not be overlooked, Congress mandated that not less than 20 percent of the basic grant be used to support program improvements and supportive services. Of those funds allocated to program improvement and supportive services, not less than 20 percent of the funds must be used for vocational guidance and counseling.

Continuing their concern for special populations, Congress stipulated that at least 20 percent of the State's basic grant allotment should be used to pay 50 percent of the cost of serving disadvantaged persons, including those who had limited English-speaking abilities. As an added incentive for the States to serve the disadvantaged, States were provided a special authorization to pay up to 100 percent of the cost of the provision of special programs for the disadvantaged to be located in areas of high concentration of youth unemployment and youth dropout. As a further measure to extend services to the disadvantaged, the Amendments provided that at least one-third of Federal funds available under a separate authorization for consumer and homemaking education be used in economically depressed areas or areas having a high rate of unemployment.

As with CETA, these Amendments served a seemingly paradoxical purpose of both decategorizing and categorizing at the same time. Whereas the purpose of the basic grant was to provide States with greater flexibility in the use of funds, the limitations imposed by the set-asides served to ensure that these funds be funneled into categorical usages. Separate authorizations for programs for the disadvantaged and the set-asides on the authorizations for consumer and homemaking education again reinforced the Federal reluctance to delegate discretionary decision powers to State and local levels, especially as they related to the provision of services to designated target populations.

NOTES

Sections of Chapter II, "A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE" draw upon the following source documents:

[1]THE NEED FOR A DEVELOPING WORK FORCE

Barlow, Melvin L. "200 Years of Vocational Education--1776-1976," American Vocational Journal. May, 1976.

[2]A GROWING CONCERN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

Levitan, Sar A., Garth L. Mangum and Ray Marshall. Human Resources and Labor Markets - Labor and Manpower in the American Economy. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

[3]CAREER EDUCATION - AN EMERGING EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENT

Herr, Edwin L. Review and Synthesis of Foundations for Career Education. Information Series No. 61. Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Vocational and Technical Education, March, 1972.

National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. A National Policy on Career Education. 8th Report. Washington, D. C.: NACVE, September, 1974.

Hoyt, Kenneth B. Career Education, Vocational Education, and Occupational Education: An Approach to Defining Differences. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, 1974.

U. S. Office of Education. Monographs on Career Education: Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Evans, Rupert N. Career Education and Vocational Education: Similarities and Contrasts. 1975.

Hoyt, Kenneth B. A Primer for Career Education. 1977.

Hoyt, Kenneth B. Refining the Career Education Concept. 1976.

Hoyt, Kenneth B. Career Education for Special Populations. 1976.

Hoyt, Kenneth B. Relationships Between Career Education and Vocational Education. 1976.

National Advisory Council for Career Education. The Efficacy of Career Education. Washington, D. C.: NACCE, 1976.

Herr, Edwin L. The Emerging History of Career Education: A Summary View. Washington, D. C.: National Advisory Council for Career Education, June, 1977.

[4] THE NEW FEDERALISM

Mirengoff, William and Lester Rindler. CETA: Manpower Programs Under Local Control. Washington, D. C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1978.

Snedeker, Bonnie B. and David M. Snedeker. CETA: Decentralization on Trial. Salt Lake City, UT: Olympus Publishing Company, 1978.

CHAPTER III

COORDINATION--THE EDUCATION SIDE

An examination of Federal legislation and accompanying committee reports gives clear evidence of congressional intent that vocational education and CETA prime sponsors coordinate their efforts to facilitate the transition from classrooms to workplaces. However, it is equally clear that coordination cannot and will not happen solely as a result of legislative mandate. Rather, coordination as the alignment of systems to serve a mutual purpose is a function of a myriad of social and institutional forces that over time have molded the present structure. Whereas the previous chapter dealt with those historical forces that shaped the capacities of institutions to respond, the present chapter will concentrate on institutional structure of vocational education and the capability of that structure to align itself with CETA in the provision of services to disadvantaged youth. The discussion will be from the vocational education perspective. The following chapter will focus on the CETA delivery system and its capability to align with vocational education.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION--A STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS

Vocational Education as a Part of Academic/General Education

The central point in the analysis of vocational education is that vocational education is embedded in the larger system of academic/general education. As a consequence of its location, the evolutionary development of vocational education has been influenced by the historical and societal forces which have shaped the structure and process of academic/general education. To understand vocational education, then, requires an understanding of the context in which it has developed and in which it continues to function.

A central consideration of that context is the role of the States in the governance of education. Although the Constitution of the United States makes no specific mention of education, the States have constitutional responsibility for education under the Tenth Amendment which provides that all powers not specifically delegated to the Federal government are reserved for the States. Most States have made this responsibility explicit in their constitutions and have charged State legislatures with the responsibility for establishing and maintaining free public schools. State legislatures are empowered to levy taxes for support of public schools and to enact legislation which provides basic mandates governing state education. Control over education is shared jointly by the executive and legislative branches of State government. Executive jurisdiction is centered in a State board of education which is responsible for the formulation of education policy. Responsibility for the administration of policy is vested in the chief state school officer who, depending upon the State, is appointed by the governor or elected by the public.

Responsibility for the delivery of education is generally delegated to local educational districts and subdivisions of the State. However, in a number of States, specific elements in the overall educational thrust of a State are reserved for the State itself to conduct (e.g., in Connecticut, the fifteen area vocational-technical schools [secondary education] and the four State Technical Colleges [two year post-secondary education] are conducted totally by the State). Local districts are empowered by state statutes to administer public education at the local level. They have the power to tax, to enter into contractual agreements, to sue and be sued, and to hire a superintendent. Educational districts are governed by local boards of education consisting of a small number of elective lay members. These boards have management decision-making responsibility in the policy, administrative and operational areas. The school superintendent serves at the pleasure of the board and functions as the chief executive officer responsible for the operation of the local school system.

Vocational Education Organization

Vocational education, being a part of the larger system of education, shares its structural characteristics. At the State level, vocational education is under the jurisdiction of the state vocational education board. In many States, the state board of education serves in a joint capacity as the state vocational education board. In other States, the state board of vocational education and the state board of education have overlapping membership. The state director of vocational education serves as the state executive officer in charge of administering vocational education programs. Lines of authority differ across States with many directors reporting to the chief state officer while others report to the state vocational education board. Vocational education professional staff typically are organized as a subdivision of the state educational agency and are responsible for the coordination and facilitation of local vocational program efforts.

The force of the state presence depends upon the extent of autonomy accorded local school boards. In those States with strong local autonomy, state vocational education personnel operate as consultants providing advice and assistance in complying with State and Federal regulations and in the development of programs to meet local needs. In those States with greater degrees of centralization, state vocational education agency personnel function as supervisors with administrative control and authority over the direction and content of local vocational education programs.

Local Organization

Delivery of vocational programs and services at the local level takes a variety of forms. In the comprehensive high school, vocational education programs are offered in conjunction with general education. Vocational education students spend a portion of their time in shops or laboratories and the remainder (approximately half of their time) in shop and laboratory related technical studies, and in general education subjects that enable them to meet the requirements for high school graduation at the same time that they acquire preparation for entry into the labor force. A variant is the specialized vocational-technical high school which provides exclusively formal preparation for jobs, plus the academic education required for high school graduation. The formal preparation for jobs includes instruction in the manipulative skills and the related technical knowledge pertaining specifically to the respective occupations. These institutions have traditionally been designed to operate as separate high school facilities, but function as part of the regular city secondary school system. They depend generally on large numbers of students in the secondary schools of a city to warrant the establishment of such an institution; hence, almost entirely, the vocational-technical high schools are located in the large urban centers. The area or vocational skills center is typically a centralized service center accommodating students from several schools and/or school districts. Often, the vocational service centers serve students in more than one county (e.g., Penta-County vocational center, near Cleveland, Ohio). The general procedure is to bus students to such a center for half a day and to return them to their home school so that another group can be served in the remaining time. Such institutions generally provide the manipulative skills and theory leaving the home schools the responsibility for providing all general education. Technical institutes or colleges are the postsecondary equivalent to specialized high schools. All the necessary vocational education is provided to enable the students and adults who have completed or left high school to prepare for entrance to the specified occupations. Activities and programs are also offered for adults who desire to upgrade and update their occupational skills. The community college is the postsecondary counterpart of the comprehensive high school. Vocational and technical as well as academic programs are offered, in varying lengths of instructional time, enabling some completers to earn a certificate and others to earn an associate degree. Other more specific programs are frequently available to meet short-term skills development and vocational and remedial needs of special segments of the population, and include new industry training, supervisory development training, apprenticeship training and others.

Administrative responsibility for vocational education programs at the local level generally resides in a local director of vocational education except in those situations where the State operates programs directly. This position is often attached to the district office and reports either directly or indirectly to the superintendent of schools. Vocational education at the school level is generally the responsibility of a supervisor or coordinator who has direct administrative authority over vocational education instructors. Vocational education at the postsecondary level is under the administrative direction of the president or school director in the case of a Technical Institute. However, in a Community College, it is under the direction (usually) of a dean of occupational programs. Occupational program areas may be headed up by a department head or divisional coordinator depending upon the administrative structure of the individual institution.

Although the state board of vocational education formulates the policies governing vocational education in the State, policy content is rooted in state statutory authority. In many States there is not a clear state legislative mandate for the provision for vocational education. States all too often have failed to legislate enabling vocational education statutes that establish purposes of vocational education, the target population to be served, the program services and activities to be provided and the allocation among educational levels of the responsibility for the provision of these services.

The Impact of Educational Financing

Vocational education frequently functions as the stepchild of general education. Perhaps this is nowhere more true than in the financing of vocational education programs. Funding of vocational education programs is generally an extension of the provisions for general education funding, with vocational education competing with other educational programs for their share of scarce state resources. Expenditures for vocational education programs frequently do not result from state appropriations targeted specifically for vocational education, but rather are the result of programmatic decisions made at the local level. Since state funds seldom are categorized by programmatic purpose, little targeting of state funds can be achieved. State funding on the basis of a flat student reimbursement with no provisions for the added cost incurred by vocational education programs serves as a disincentive for local districts to add new programs, or, at best, encourages them to offer low-cost, high-enrollment programs.

Similar situations exist with respect to local funding. In some instances local vocational education districts exist with the authority to levy a specific tax to be used for the support of vocational education programs. In other instances, local funds are appropriated specifically for vocational education. However, these instances tend to be the exception rather than the rule. Local funds for educational use are more apt to be appropriated in response to local education agencies' budget requests which reflect priorities set at the discretion of local education boards. Hence, there are generally few safeguards built into the financial structure of most States. There is little to ensure that funds authorized and/or intended to be spent for vocational education are in fact expended for that purpose. In the absence of prohibition to the contrary, locals are free to use funds that may be tagged for vocational education to supplant other funds, thereby freeing them for discretionary reallocation at the local level and subverting the intended use of the funds.

Matching and Maintenance of Effort

Two factors have traditionally been held to influence vocational education capability to mount new programs to meet changing societal needs. One of these is the matching requirement. The other is the maintenance-of-effort clause in Federal vocational education legislation. States are required to use state and/or local funds to pay 50 percent of the cost of carrying out their approved annual plans for vocational education. States are not required to match Federal with non-Federal funds for each purpose in programs authorized under the Act with the exception of national priority programs, which include the disadvantaged set-aside and the use of Federal funds for state and local administration. Maintenance of effort requires that the state and local education agencies must maintain their current fiscal expenditures for vocational education either on a per student or an aggregate basis in comparison to the amount expended in the previous year. In order to maintain effort, state and local agencies are required to expend at least 95 percent of the amount expended the previous year.

States frequently achieve matching on a statewide basis by requiring that each local eligible applicant for Federal funds assume a share of the matching requirement. Imposition of a matching requirement on districts with unequal distribution of wealth tends to act as a deterrent to the offering of new programs for those districts who cannot raise the required matching amount. The matching requirement tends to force growth in the direction of expansion of existing programs since local funds already invested in these programs can be used as a match to draw more Federal funds. Matching in these cases may have the unintended effect of contravening the purposes of Federal funds to promote new and innovative approaches to local needs.

When coupled with maintenance of effort, the chilling effect on the planning of new programs is even more apparent. Local education agencies and institutions are understandably reluctant to commit resources to meet emerging needs when the commitment of these resources will lock them into a higher funding level in subsequent fiscal years. Local educational boards, sensitive to a growing fiscal conservatism of their constituencies, are hesitant to respond to educational needs when that response will reduce their discretionary funds by committing them to higher expenditure expectations. Maintenance of effort mediates against seeking increased efficiency of operation since funding levels cannot be reduced, even if the existing level of services can be maintained at less cost through improved efficiency of programmatic performance.

In recognition of the limits imposed by matching. Congress in Technical Amendments to the Education Amendments of 1978 provided that States may exceed the 50 percent Federal share by making larger payments to educational agencies and other institutions who are otherwise financially unable to provide such programs. The effect of this change is not readily apparent since it is not clear whether or not these States must maintain a statewide match of 50 percent. If so, then the State must "rob Peter to pay Paul" with the decrease in matching being compensated by the increases in contribution from other areas. The limited availability of funds for excess matching makes the impact of this change problematical.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND THE DISADVANTAGED

Definitional Differences

The disadvantaged have traditionally been considered one of the populations with special vocational education needs. As defined in the vocational education legislation, disadvantaged refers to those who have academic or economic handicaps and who by virtue of these handicaps find it impossible to succeed in a regular vocational education program without special services and assistance. Disadvantaged excludes handicapped persons who are defined as those who are mentally retarded, hard-of-hearing, deaf, speech-impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled or otherwise health-impaired, and whose handicapping condition prevents them from succeeding in regular vocational programs. By virtue of their definitions, persons may be either handicapped or disadvantaged, but not both.

These definitions shift the emphasis from the personal disadvantagements of the individual to the program requirements. That is to say, where an individual may have an academic or economic disadvantagement that inhibits his capability to succeed in one program, these disadvantagements may not inhibit his performance in another program. Thus, the determination of disadvantages from a vocational education perspective is program-specific and not a characteristic of the individual. This differs materially from the CETA definition of disadvantaged, which is solely in terms of financial eligibility, a characteristic of the individual that does not differ across programs. Another distinction is that the vocational education regulations define economic disadvantagement in terms of the poverty level which is a census concept. In contrast, CETA eligibility standards are based on the lower living standard income level which is determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Definitional incompatibilities are further compounded by the fact that a student who, because of academic disadvantagement, may qualify under the vocational education definition may fail to meet the financial eligibility standards incorporated in the CETA definition.

Vocational education legislation requires that 20 percent of the basic grant be used to pay for 50 percent of the cost of the programs serving the disadvantaged proposed under the annual state plan. Federal funds under the basic grants to the States can be used only to pay for the excess cost of vocational education. Excess cost is defined as the cost of serving the disadvantaged that is over and above the average for regular programs. The set-aside requirements for the disadvantaged, by designating the purpose for which the basic grant must be expended, serve as de facto categorization of the funds to serve designated priority areas.

Set-asides as a Targeting Strategy

Use of the set-asides to direct programmatic services and activities to designated special populations has been a major Federal strategy. The relative effectiveness of this strategy can be determined by a comparison of the State/local to Federal match ratio for regular and disadvantaged programs. With regard to secondary vocational education programs, States in fiscal year 1976 invested $8.23 of state and local dollars for every Federal dollar expended, whereas only $2.20 was invested in programs for the disadvantaged [Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (BOAE), U.S. Office of Education, 1978]. The match statistic for the disadvantaged, being an average, is deceptive since it masks the fact that in 1976, 35 States had an over-match ratio for the disadvantaged of less than $2.20 and 29 States had a match ratio of less than $1.00 (BOAE, op. cit., Table 12). The data further revealed that whereas total enrollments in programs for the disadvantaged increased by nearly 33 percent between 1971 and 1976, relative enrollment in programs for the disadvantaged declined over that period as a percentage of the total enrollment in vocational education.

A variety of factors may account for the disparity in Federal over-matching for the disadvantaged. Perhaps the simplest and most direct explanation is that the States and locals simply have little incentive to invest in programs for the disadvantaged. In fact, there may be a counter-incentive. States are required to match the excess cost for serving the disadvantaged from a separate matching pool. Regulations preclude them from using the over-match on regular programs to count toward the match for excess cost for serving the disadvantaged. Thus, States are required to secure matching monies for disadvantaged programs from other sources although they may be significantly over-matching in regular programs serving secondary, postsecondary and/or adult students. This requirement places a burden on the States to secure matching funds from previously untapped sources. In many instances, the amount of Federal funds allocated to the local districts is so small that relatively little can be done with funds except, perhaps, to buy a piece of equipment. As a result, many local districts are returning Federal funds for the disadvantaged with the explanation that benefits received do not outweigh the cost involved in terms of reporting requirements and loss of freedom. Part of their concern emanates from the regulations that stipulate that any state or local dollars used for matching are subject to the same regulations as are expenditures of Federal dollars. This, coupled with the fact that additional expenditures incur a continual obligation through the maintenance of effort clause, tends to dampen local enthusiasm to respond to Federal priorities.

Ability of Federal Funds to Target State and Local Resources

Perhaps the crux of the matter rests with the nature of the Federal/State/local relationship. The Federal approach to education, because of the constitutional delegation of powers to the State, has been cast in the form of a partnership. An emerging principle is developing that the Federal role is to provide funds to be used as catalytic agents to stimulate state and local response to Federally initiated priorities. The basic premise under which this principle operates is that state and local funding arrangements have flexibility to gravitate towards Federal priority areas. More and more, however, this assumption is being demonstrated untenable. Unlike Federal funding, state and local financial systems have little flexibility to target funding in response to specific problems and populations. Funding rigidities exist both in flexibility and of expenditure patterns and in increases in appropriations to provide the latitude for this flexibility. As a result, States and locals are often unable and/or unwilling to shift their focus to match Federal priorities. It is upon this rock that the use of the Federal/ State partnership to respond to special priorities is floundering.

In the presence of such inflexibility, a Federal priority such as the disadvantaged serves to dilute the overall vocational education effort. Expenditures for funds for priority areas tend to reduce the total amount of funds available for the support of vocational education programs meeting state and local needs and are resisted or are met with minimum compliance. Since state and local appropriations are sticky and tend to rise rather slowly, if at all, expenditure patterns once established cannot be easily altered. The effects of the Federal priority areas thus tend to result in a general dilution of the basic vocational education efforts in the State. Hence, state financial systems as presently structured tend to mitigate against marshalling vocational education programs and services to meet the needs of special populations identified as priority targets at the Federal level.

Equalization of state financing for education contributes to the dampening of the state response to Federal priorities. Equalization of state aid to education tends to compensate for relative inequities in local districts' ability and willingness to support education. Targeting of Federal, state and local monies to serve the emergent needs of special populations tends to allocate resources independently of the equalization factors and by so doing tends to upset the equalization balance. This situation is yet another example of the pervasive difficulty of attuning both the Federal and state/local educational systems to respond to the situations that may be defined as a national problem--a problem whose intensity and magnitude may vary considerably across States and localities.

The Effects of Accountability

The extent of the responsiveness of vocational education to the needs of the disadvantaged is, in part, a function of the extent to which vocational education will be held accountable. The Education Amendments of 1976 provide that States shall evaluate each program purporting to develop entry-level skills according to the extent to which program completers find employment in occupations relating to their training and are judged by their employers to be well trained and prepared for employment. The disadvantaged, by virtue of the definition, are those who require special assistance to succeed in regular programs. They are frequently characterized by deficiencies in basic education, possess a value system frequently divergent from the middle class work ethic orientation, and require a greater commitment of resources to achieve a minimum level of competency. Because they are in effect "special" and do require additional resources, they tend to constitute a higher risk population for vocational education. Given the importance of placement in occupations relating to training and the greater difficulty in placing the disadvantaged, vocational educators tend to skirt this problem by admitting only the more qualified disadvantaged. By taking only the more qualified of the disadvantaged, the probability of failure is reduced and vocational education is judged by society as being more accountable.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION/CETA COORDINATION--THE STATE OF THE PRACTICE

Project results will be analyzed and their dependency on contextual and in situational factors examined. No attempt will be made to document the diversity of coordinative mechanisms encountered or to assess the mechanism in terms of impact on the employment of those served. Program narratives are contained in Volume I with a description and analysis of the diversity of mechanisms encountered provided in Volume II. It is the specific purpose of this section to synthesize the kinds and nature of the coordinative responses to the historical and institutional forces previously described. Because of the focus of the project, attention will be principally devoted to coordination involving YEDPA supported programs.

Summary Results

Coordination between vocational education and YEDPA prime sponsors can best be characterized by the following summary observations:

- The commonality in vocational education/ CETA coordination has been employability skills with work experience only weakly tied into educational goals and objectives;

- CETA-funded vocational education programs have not been institutionalized, remaining as adjuncts to the educational establishment;
- Vocational education at the secondary level is experiencing difficulty in providing services to disadvantaged youth, particularly out-of-school youth, whom the educational establishment is often reluctant to serve;
- Incentives and support for building cooperative mechanisms have been subordinated in favor of providing more direct services to youth.

Work Experience--The Prevailing Delivery Mode

A hallmark of nearly every program observed was the dominant emphasis on work experience as the major delivery mode for the facilitation of the transition from education to work. The genesis of the conventional wisdom regarding work experience can be traced back to early attempts to deal with unemployment and poverty. As manpower programs geared up to teach people occupational skills, it became apparent that these skills could not be taught without consideration being given to attitudes, personal habits, emotional responses to life situations, attitudes toward work and experience in career planning and job search skills. Thus, manpower programs came to emphasize the importance of providing counseling, guidance and placement services as major components of the program. This shift of emphasis can be seen in the expenditures for selected manpower programs. Whereas from fiscal year 1966 to fiscal year 1972 the expenditures for classroom training increased by only 17 percent, expenditures for work experiences for youth increased 105 percent during the same period with the expenditure for on-the-job training increasing by 1355 percent (Mirengoff and Rindler, p. 17).

Work experience is frequently accompanied by transition services. These transition services generally include counseling and guidance services with the emphasis usually upon the development of employability skills. Employability skills center on the development of attitudes, acceptance of authority and responsibility, dress codes and other procedures and techniques aimed at making an enrollee immediately employable. Remedial skills in communication and mathematics are less frequently offered in the context of CETA-funded programs. Outreach and recruitment is frequently performed by the schools and limited to an in-school population. Programs designed to serve out-of-school youth occasionally make use of community-based organizations to perform the outreach functions. Funded programs usually run for two semesters or two semesters plus a summer. For those programs which incorporate a summer, funding for the summer is frequently obtained through the summer youth employment programs.

Three basic models exist for the incorporation of classroom and work experience. In one variant, classroom training is concentrated in the early stages of the program followed by extensive periods of work experience. An alternative is to mix classroom and work experience on a daily basis with students working and going to school a portion of each day. It is not uncommon to find schools offering extended-day services to accommodate those students in late afternoon who are working in the mornings. The third alternative encountered is alternating blocks of classroom and work experience.

Awarding of Academic Credit

Academic credit was frequently given for work experience. Credit was most generally determined on the basis of time spent, with one unit of elective credit generally given for a specified number of hours of classroom and/or job experience. Credit for work experience often followed the procedures used for awarding credit for co-op education. Credit for academic courses was seldom, if ever, awarded upon completion of the CETA-funded programs.

Offering of credits on the basis of demonstrated competencies achieved was an infrequent practice among the sites observed.

Although plans for ensuring that work experience was coordinated with academic experience were frequently referenced, little evidence was obtained to indicate that work experience was actually coordinated with an on-going program of academic activities. More often, these programs seem to function as adjuncts to existing programs offering the disadvantaged youth but a brief respite from the on-going institutional routine. Work experience programs were seldom designed to develop explicitly-defined competencies nor did work experience programs seem to be designed so as to evaluate the results obtained. Integration with academic programs frequently extended no further than students being encouraged to identify job problems and to bring these problems back to the classroom as a basis for "rap" sessions with teachers and counselors.

Limited Emphasis on Placement

Consistent with CETA manpower philosophy, the major thrust of many of the programs seemed to be preparation to secure and hold immediate employment. Since most of the programs were person centered with emphasis on attitudinal change and job search skills, little emphasis seemed to be given to placement in related occupations as a criterion of program success. Rather, the interest focused on positive placements with little distinction drawn as to whether it was placement in a public service training slot or placement in unsubsidized employment. Responsibility for program placements tended to be placed on teachers and/or counselors attached to the program rather than to depend upon external placement services such as those provided by the school or the local employment security offices.

Lack of Funds for Program Support

Few programs were encountered that utilized CETA funds for the development of programmatic supportive services. The more common usage was for the provision of direct services through hiring of teachers and/or counselors. Few indigenously developed curriculum materials were noted. Occupational assessment procedures when used were those available from commercial suppliers. Ceta funds had been used in at least one instance to develop an information system for joint use by education and CETA prime sponsors. In general, however, instances of funds being used to support the development of a management and curricula infrastructure to support on-going coordinative efforts were exceedingly rare.

Explanation of Results

A multiplicity of contextual factors contribute to an accounting of observed results. YEDPA endorses work experience or on-the-job experience in combination with transition services as the model activity for dealing with the employment and training problems of disadvantaged youth. Its conventional wisdom prevails even in the absence of evidence that work experience contributes to positive attitudes, work habits or improved job skills for youth. Not only is work experience a favored method of the Department of Labor, but it is also consistent with the career education emphasis on learning through simulated career experiences. Thus, both parties tend to share a common philosophy toward work experience as a transition tool--a sharing that tends to promote alignment of public schools and prime sponsors toward meeting the needs of disadvantaged youth.

The result of this alignment is a humanistic-affective orientation to the development of youth employability skills. The de-emphasis on the development of cognitive and psychomotor skills and their failure to be integrated into a program for the development of job-specific skills represents an educational approach with questionable impact on the short- and long-run employability of youth. The unanswered question is whether the person-centered approach with its penchant for concentrating on the development of affective awareness is more conducive to the long-term development and upward employment mobility of disadvantaged youth than would a more skills-oriented approach addressed to preparation for entry and advancement in a specific occupation or occupational grouping. Work experience supplemented by career counseling may indeed predispose disadvantaged youth for employment. However, it is not clear that this necessarily insures that they will be prepared for and find other than dead-end jobs with a deadening effect on career development. Resolution as to the proper emphasis to be given job skills in the education and training of disadvantaged youth must soon be forthcoming lest the opportunity for their preparation to make a productive contribution toward a more vigorous society slip away.

Autonomy of Observed Programs

A significant characteristic of the programs observed is that they tend not to be integrated into the institutional fabric of the school. They stand rather apart as independent entities designed to serve a special function. As independent entities, they can be conveniently excised when the need or funding no longer exists. This appendicized relationship is particularly characteristic of programs on a soft money basis. The school administration, knowing that the funding source is negotiated on an annual basis and that it is subject to withdrawal upon the unitary action of the prime sponsor, is reluctant to make a commitment that will obligate regular educational funds. Thus, staff tend to be hired on a temporary basis so as to facilitate their discharge or transfer upon the event of project termination. Alternatively, regular staff are hired on an extended-day basis to provide services as needed to disadvantaged enrollees. Use of the extended day for regular educational staff is more prevalent for instructors than it is for counselors and job-site coordinators.

CETA-supported programs are typically insulated in the school infrastructure. Unless the program has a sustained period of funding, there is little opportunity for program staff to develop communication linkages and personal contacts within the school. Regular instructors frequently view these programs with suspicion and express disdain for the educational methods used. Administrative support for programs varies considerably. In some instances, especially where school administrators were involved from the inception of the program, there was strong evidence of administrative support and backing. In many other instances, school administrators tended to support the program in concept only with little tangible evidence of support ascertained. Program staff, being heavily involved with the provision of transition services to youth both on the school premises and on the work experience sites, did not have the time nor were they in sufficiently close proximity to develop on-going attachments with regular school personnel and activities.

Lack of Vocational Education Involvement

Involvement of regular vocational education staff did not seem to be a frequent occurrence. Most of the program personnel were not regular vocational education instructors at the school, although some programs did employ vocationally certified instructors. Just as regular school vocational instructors seemed to play a minor role in the operation of these programs, so did the utilization of the regular vocational education equipment and laboratories. Few instances were noted where programs were in any way integrated with regular vocational education programs and/or equipment.

The prevailing organizational arrangement was to separate the program at least administratively, if not physically. Since many of the programs utilized work experience at off-site locations, minimum spatial demands were required. In almost all instances, observed enrollees were treated as intact class groups with little or no attempt made to integrate these groups into regular scholastic activities. Almost no use was noted of purchases of slots for individual referrals to on-going regular programs. In some instances, separate facilities were provided at off-school sites such as storefront locations or other arrangements for an alternative school. In the sense that students in YEDPA-supported programs tend to be treated as intact groups and separated from the regular classroom activities, the prevailing service delivery mode is patterned after the skills center concept popularized in the MDTA period.

Analysis of the funding sources of the observed programs revealed few instances of the use of vocational education funds in conjunction with CETA funds to support programs. This is not to say, however, that schools did not make in-kind contributions or that programs initially supported with CETA funds may not be subsequently supported with Federal, State or local vocational education funds. Programs were frequently supported from multiple funding sources with CETA Title II monies and vocational education Title II set-asides being the most frequent sources.

Not only was there a noticeable absence of the mutual use of vocational education and CETA funds, there was a noticeable reluctance to use vocational education programs, especially vocational cooperative education programs. Vocational education cooperative education program personnel expressed concern that work experience placement would take up all the available work experience slots making it more difficult to place the regular vocational education co-op student. Placement slots being hard to develop, instructors tended to be guarded and infringement by short-term CETA programs resented as interference.

Conclusions

It is dubious as to whether the public schools in fact have aligned themselves so as to be in accord with CETA in the provision of transition services to disadvantaged youth. What is perhaps more appropriate to conclude is that schools are accommodating to CETA prime sponsors as external funding sources for programmatic support. Since these funds are unilaterally controlled by the prime sponsor, school administrators prudently do not make commitments to the integration since support of these programs could be detrimental if program support is withdrawn. The result is that externally supportive programs tend to function on the periphery of the educational establishment and are only weakly rooted in the school infrastructure. Because of their insulated position, it is extremely difficult for these programs to exert any leverage for change in the existing institutional arrangements. These programs frequently are regarded as special programs for problem kids that, if successful, may relieve social pressure and permit schools to get on with their business of providing an academic education.

Vocational education is frequently at a disadvantage in providing services to disadvantaged youth. Existing training stations and equipment are often not sufficient to meet the needs of regular vocational education students. This situation places the CETA-supported programs at a competitive disadvantage in the competition for scarce resources. CETA students are frequently more expensive to serve in that economic disadvantagements are frequently accompanied by academic disadvantagements. With multiple disadvantagements, students often require additional resources in the form of more intensive counseling and guidance, remedial education, transportation services, and not infrequently, health-related services. Because of the debilitating effects of these disadvantagements, educational efficiency is reduced in that more resource inputs are required to effect developmental improvements. Since many of these students are unable to succeed in regular vocational courses without supportive services and since the resources to provide adequate support of services are frequently not forthcoming, these students are not actively sought for admission into the regular vocational education programs. A natural selection occurs with those students requiring the least amount of remediation being most likely to gain access. Given the current accountability standards wherein success is judged by the number of students placed in related occupations and the press for scarce resources, these decisions seem to be prompted by the economic necessity of maximizing returns per unit of resources expended.

Much of the difficulty encountered in serving the disadvantaged resides not so much in vocational education itself as it does in the character of the educational system of which vocational education is a part. Vocational education in most comprehensive high schools has little discretion with regard to funding, granting of academic credit, prevailing academic philosophy, use of the school for community-oriented activities, disciplinary practices and procedures and many other general pedagogical practices and customs that condition the range and quality of services available to disadvantaged students. The capabilities of schools to provide transportation for CETA youth, school policy toward the provision of health-related support services and, in fact, the entire general orientation toward disadvantaged youth is largely beyond the span of control of vocational education.

The tendency of schools to divide the educational system into separate tracks leads to a lack of cross-articulation that results in many youth being lost in the interstices. This fragmentation and separation of the educational system into educational turf works to the ultimate disadvantage of the youth seeking guidance and direction. Outreach activities are frequently the responsibility of individual instructors with assessment responsibility being assigned to a separate staff function. This separation of function impedes a comprehensive and integrative approach to dealing with the problems of disadvantaged youth. Overworked school counselors are unable to provide the assistance to youth in the development of a plan for negotiating the transition from education to work. Educational staff including vocational educators generally lack the knowledge, skills, and competencies to deal with the unique problems of the disadvantaged, and, thus, are frequently accused of not understanding or caring for their needs, hurts and concerns. Again, the problem transcends vocational education and resides instead in the general inability of the educational system to adequately respond to the national priorities of youth employability.

The problems encountered in responding to the needs of disadvantaged youth are further intensified by the lack of available resources for program support and improvement. CETA funding is client-oriented with the majority of funding oriented to the provision of direct services and subsidies to CETA enrollees. Unlike the vocational education legislation, no monies are authorized directly for the provision of funds for programmatic improvement and supporting services. Thus, in the absence of funds and in view of the scarcity of educational resources, little system-building capacity can be expected to take place. Unless funds are specifically targeted for the development of methods and procedures for competency identification, testing, assessment, individualized learning, and a host of other uses, CETA/vocational education cooperative efforts can be expected to continue to emphasize a work experience approach--an approach that is but marginally related to a total integrative educational experience. To enable the schools to deal effectively with employability and employment of disadvantaged youth requires expenditures to develop their capabilities to deal effectively with this population. It requires that funds be authorized and available for use in educational and professional development, development of curricular and instructional materials oriented specifically to serving the needs of the disadvantaged, and the development of supporting and assessment procedures that will enable the schools to better measure and track the performance of disadvantaged youth. Unless the resources for the development of these capabilities are forthcoming, educational efforts to serve CETA disadvantaged youth will continue to be a low-budget/low-priority effort to provide youth with a brief interlude of exposure to career counseling and guidance and a quick walk through the world of work highlighting points of interest along the way.

CHAPTER IV

COORDINATION--THE PRIME SPONSOR

No analysis of the context of coordination would be complete without a discussion of the prime sponsors and their influence on the coordinative relation. The discussion of the prime sponsors will touch upon the administrative structure and process, program delivery models utilized, and factors influencing choice of program deliverers. Specifically, administration will outline the programmatic structure--discuss the influence of prime sponsor personnel on coordination and describe prime sponsor planning, monitoring, and evaluation activities. Program delivery models will investigate the principal delivery strategies employed by prime sponsors. The last section will describe their emerging role in the choice of program deliverers.

ADMINISTRATION

Programmatic Structure

A prime sponsor is officially described in CETA as a State or a unit of local government with a population in excess of 100,000, any consortium of units of local government, any unit of general local government or any consortium without regard for population that may be designated by the Secretary as prime sponsor to meet a distinct need not otherwise being filled with the number of existing concentrated employment program grantees. In a unit of local government, the mayor or city manager is designated the chief administrative officer. The office of the prime sponsor consists of the chief administrative officer and a supporting staff. The chief elected official or city manager seldom plays any direct role in the administration, this function being delegated to an executive director or administrator. The executive director or administrator is responsible for the functions of financial management, management information systems, contracts and grants administration, independent monitoring, planning, and program operations. Depending on the size of the prime sponsorship, one or more of these functions may be assigned to an administrator or assistant director who may have additional staff under his jurisdiction to perform that specific function.

Personnel

Prime sponsor personnel are drawn from a variety of backgrounds. Unlike education, personnel are not bound together by a commonality of principles and methods or a strong professional association. Prime sponsor staff frequently have a strong identification with the client group served by CETA. Since prime sponsor staff are generally not educators nor are they as often likely to be trained in the area of education or related disciplines, they tend not to share a common bond of understanding with nor affinity for educators.

Prime sponsor staffs nationwide are plagued with high turnover rates. The short tenure of many prime sponsor staffs makes it difficult to establish the necessary contacts and communication links with local educational personnel.

Program Planning

As with vocational education, prime sponsors are required to prepare a program plan. Prime sponsor staff provide primary input into the preparation of this plan. Among other things, this comprehensive employment and training plan is to include a statement of the long-term goals to be accomplished, the methods by which educational agencies will be involved in the achievement of these goals, a description of the procedures used to select deliverers of employment and training services, and a description of appropriate arrangements with educational agencies including the methods that will be utilized to ensure participation of public vocational education in the achievement of identified employment and training goals and objectives.

A prime sponsor planning council is mandated by law and required to participate in the development of comprehensive employment and training plans. The planning council is required to have a broad area of representation including at least one member representing public vocational education. The role of the planning council is advisory with the prime sponsor having the legal right to act unilaterally. Their legislatively mandated role notwithstanding, the extent of influence of the planning council differs by type of sponsor. In a survey conducted by the Department of Labor, approximately seven out of every eight city, county, or consortiate prime sponsors sampled indicated that the planning council had modest to no influence. In contrast, nearly three out of every ten balance-of-state sponsors sampled indicated that the council had a major influence in their operations (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, p. 111).

Although the influence of the planning council may differ from prime sponsor to prime sponsor, the planning process is structured to provide for political input. In that the planning council membership provides for representation from a variety of potential service deliverers, rivalry and turfsmanship on the planning council may play a considerable part in determining the planned role that perspective service deliverers can and will play. Since CETA funds are controlled by elected officials, the decisions regarding the final allocation and use of these funds tend to be influenced by political factors. Thus, the relationship between the city council as the governing city unit and the local school board as the governing educational unit ultimately affects the extent of linkages between prime sponsors and education. In those instances where there is a direct line of influence from city government to local school boards, the likelihood of a coordinated approach to the services provided disadvantaged youth is significantly higher than in those instances where the governing boards are at loggerheads.

Dissynchronization of the planning process is frequently given as a factor inhibiting coordinative activities between education and prime sponsors. Prime sponsors receiving their money directly from the Federal government operate under the Federal fiscal year which begins 30 September. Since no forward funding provisions exist for CETA appropriations and since Congress frequently delays action on Department of Labor appropriations, it is not unusual for prime sponsor funds not to be released until the fiscal year has begun. Planning in the public schools, however, is driven by the school time schedule. Because instructors have to be hired and arrangements made prior to the beginning of the fall semester, schools experience difficulty in accommodating to a funding situation in which they may not know for three or four months into the semester what program funds will be available to them from CETA. This incongruity makes coordinated planning difficult and mitigates against administrative alignment of the two systems.

A Monitoring and Compliance Orientation

Because of the increased emphasis on tightening the accountability of management of CETA programs, local prime sponsors are strengthening their monitoring and evaluation efforts. Monitoring activities conducted through independent monitoring units established in the prime sponsorship are placing increasing demands on program deliverers to provide information on the characteristics of clients served, the nature of services provided, and the impact obtained. Increased reporting requirements are likely to strain the capabilities of local public schools to provide such data and may contribute to a reluctance on the part of the public schools to become involved in an activity that will add to their already overtaxed reporting capacity.

Whereas CETA was originally conceived as a decategorized program, the mantle of Federal oversight transcended the shift to decentralized manpower program delivery. A key component of the continuing Federal role is to ensure compliance with the legislation. This role is carried out through the issuance of regulations and guides establishing mechanisms for hearings and appeals and the provision of technical assistance. An increasing flow of Federal directives emanates from the Department of Labor through policy guides, field memoranda, and other devices to communicate changes and interpretation of the regulations. Responsibility for the interpretation and application of the regulations to specific prime sponsors is assigned to Department of Labor regional offices. Within each regional office a Federal representative is assigned to work with specific prime sponsors. Their role is to monitor performance of prime sponsors under their jurisdiction and to provide interpretative assistance whenever necessary.

This growing maze of regulations that surrounds the CETA program has a negative effect on coordination. Public schools, already overburdened, are hesitant to get involved in a program that will add to their paperwork. Schools as potential deliverers of employment and training services frequently have neither the time nor the personnel who are sufficiently knowledgeable of CETA regulations. Not being knowledgeable of the "rules of the game" places schools at a competitive disadvantage in competing with other more seasoned service deliverers for the pool of available CETA funds. The increasing complexity of regulations forces prime sponsor staff more and more into a monitoring role. The separate jargon and specialized knowledge tends to widen and deepen the gulf between prime sponsors and educators making bridging efforts more difficult.

The Role of the State

The role of the State in the delivery of employment and training services is limited largely to serving as a sponsor for the balance-of-state. The State in serving as a balance-of-state prime sponsor generally follows one of four categorical models depending upon the extent of centralization or decentralization of the planning process and the extent of centralization or decentralization of program operational decisions. The balance-of-state, being made up of sparsely populated counties and/or units of government that could have otherwise qualified but chose not to, is generally divided into sub-units consisting of counties or some organization of local government such as councils of governments or their equivalent. CETA funds and operational control are then delegated to these local units and can generally be classified according to one of the four models. States which have delegated both the planning function and the program operation decision-making function to local units perform little more than an allocative function and tend to exert minor influence on local actions. Depending on their degree of control, States that have chosen to maintain some input into the planning process and/or programmatic decision-making are in a much more advantageous position for impacting on the extent of coordination between local units and local school boards. In those instances, coordination generally first occurs at the State level and then filters down to the local level in much the same manner as did the arrangements under the old MDTA structure. The extent of state influence, then, on local coordination is essentially restricted to the balance-of-state operations and is dependent on the nature and extent of the control retained by state sponsors.

Prime Sponsor Philosophy

The philosophy of the prime sponsor regarding preferred modes of services exerts a considerable influence on the extent and manifestation of coordination exhibited between prime sponsors and public schools. The steady movement toward work experience as a preferred delivery mode does much to explain its prevalence in the supported programs in the public schools. This preference is easily documented. The distribution of CETA Title I enrollees for fiscal year 1976 showed that nearly half of all Title I clients were enrolled in work experience followed by approximately one-third enrolled in classroom training (Mirengoff and Rindler, 1978, p. 119). Survey data also revealed that the preference for work experience depends upon the characteristics of the prime sponsors. For example, balance-of-state prime sponsors exhibit the greatest preference for work experience. When classified by size of prime sponsor, small prime sponsors exhibit a greater preference for work experience. When classified by level of unemployment, the prime sponsors in service areas of high unemployment have a greater tendency to utilize work experience as the preferred program activity.

These results are certainly not counter-intuitive. Since work experience can be accomplished in a shorter period of time with less expenditure of resources, it is not surprising that the smaller primes and those in areas of high unemployment seize upon the conventional wisdom of work experience as the preferred mode. This, coupled with the philosophical compatibility of work experience and career education, would lead to a ready acceptance on the part of the public schools.

Choice in Selection of Program Deliverers

Prime sponsors under CETA have come to exercise considerable choice in the selection of program service

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

This report has attempted to trace out the contours of the context in which coordination occurs. Like a ripple effect in reverse, these broad-based and pervasive contextual factors cascade toward the local level where they converge to form the causal field in which coordination occurs. Thus, the recommendations will follow this analogy with more general recommendations for structural change being followed by specific recommendations for action to promote and enhance coordination. Recommendations will be offered at the Federal, State and local levels. Insofar as possible, the recommendations will recognize the bipartisan efforts between education and labor required to create a climate conducive to a cooperative effort to enhance youth employability. Specific recommendations will be addressed to Congress, to the Department of Education, to the Department of Labor, to the State Vocational Education Agency, to the State Employment and Training Council, to local education agencies and to local prime sponsors.

CONGRESS

CONGRESS SHOULD CONSIDER PASSAGE OF A COMPREHENSIVE YOUTH EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT ACT.

- *This act should provide that local education agencies have joint responsibility with CETA prime sponsors for the education-to-work transition of all disadvantaged youth.*

By making this a statement of national policy, Congress could provide a mandate for cooperation. The roles in this cooperative venture should be clearly defined.

Education should have responsibility for the education and training of all disadvantaged youth--both those in school and out of school. The role of the prime sponsor should be to establish a partnership relationship with education in the establishment of viable linkages between education and work. This policy, once articulated, will set the foundation for a unification of the houses of education and labor--a unification that would serve to increase the long-term employability and employment of our nation's youth.

This policy would have significant impact on the current context of cooperation. The scope of educational responsibility would be widened to include out-of-school youth. No longer would dropouts or pushouts be an acceptable justification for shifting the responsibility of disadvantaged youth from the schools to the community-at-large. As with the Education of the Handicapped Act (P.L. 94-142), education's responsibility would continue until some arbitrarily designated age cutoff. Since both P.L. 94-142 and CETA-Title IV designate 21 as the upper age limit for eligible youth, it would seem appropriate to terminate education's responsibility for disadvantaged youth at that age.

A point of clarification may be in order regarding the notion of responsibility. The charge that education has responsibility for disadvantaged youth until age 21 is not to be interpreted that all disadvantaged youth must be served only by local education agencies. This responsibility could be delegated by agreement to a variety of service deliverers depending on State policy, the needs of individual youth and the availability of delivery mechanisms best suited to serve these needs. What cannot be delegated or abdicated under this recommendation, however, is the accountability to society to make quality education and training available to all disadvantaged youth. By formally declaring local education agencies responsible for the education and training needs of disadvantaged youth, the denial or duplication of services because of interagency disputes can be minimized.

To assign education unilateral responsibility for disadvantaged youth without delineation of a parallel role for prime sponsors would be a meaningless exercise. Consequently, the following recommendation addresses the allocation of joint responsibilities so as to result in a complementary and integrative rather than a competitive and fragmented system for the delivery of transitional youth services.

- *Responsibility for the provision of trancition services to disadvantaged youth should be rationally allocated between education and prime sponsors.*

Consistent with their recommended charge, education should be responsible for all programmatic education and training activities for disadvantaged youth inclusive of classroom instruction, career guidance services, cooperative work experience, and on-the-job training. The prime sponsor should be responsible for the payment of student stipends and employer subsidies, provision of transitional and counter-cyclical public service employment opportunities, provision of transportation assistance, child care, and other necessary supportive services, and the requisite financial, management and contractual administration necessary for the provision of these services.

This allocation of functional activity makes explicit the differentiation of functions implied in the first recommendation. Education is allocated those functions which are clearly derivatives of its societal role of enhancing general cognitive awareness and developing specific abilities, competencies, and skills. The prime sponsor allocation centers on those activities which have not historically been assumed by education but which perform a critical support function in the development of youth potential. Payment of student stipends and employer subsidies and the performance of the necessary accounting and financial management tasks often exceed the capabilities of schools both in resources and a predisposition to accomplish. By specializing the activities, complementary roles can be well defined and integrated so as to enable a cooperative effort in the preparation of youth for stable and productive employment.

- *An individualized youth employability plan should be prepared for each disadvantaged youth served.*

Individualized youth employability plans should be the base of all programmatic efforts to serve disadvantaged youth. These plans should indicate an individual youth's long-term career goals or, if unspecified, should describe an exploratory process for their specification. These plans should specify the immediate and intermediate objectives necessary to achieve stated goals. Each objective should be defined in terms of the desired education and/or employment outcomes. These outcomes should be stated as major milestones for events in the transition process. Transition services and strategies for the obtainment of these milestones should be identified and a timetable for their attainment specified. A plan should be developed for each disadvantaged youth and should be periodically updated until the youth by virtue of age is no longer a responsibility of the system.

- *Preparation of an individualized youth employability plan should be the responsibility of a committee consisting of the youth, parent (or legal guardian, as appropriate), secondary school counselor, postsecondary school counselor, prime sponsor representative, and employment and security counselor.*

The composition of the committee responsible for the preparation of the plans reflects the major agency actors that should be involved in the provision of comprehensive transition services to disadvantaged youth. The involvement of the youth in the preparation of the plan is critical if the plan is to provide meaningful guidance and direction through the transitional period. Parental involvement is advisable from a legal as well as a societal standpoint since parental support of the youth's career desires and ambitions can exert strong positive influence on their attainment. Counselors from the secondary system are recommended to be involved because of the prime responsibility of the local education agencies for the education and training of disadvantaged youth. Postsecondary counselors should be involved in recognition of the fact that postsecondary institutions represent a significant resource in the development of youth potential. Counselors are the recommended representatives from the education agency because they are most directly concerned with career development and its educational applications. The prime sponsors, because of their supportive responsibility, must play an active role in the development of the individual plans. Employment security agencies are represented because of their knowledge of the local labor market conditions and their legally mandated responsibility for providing services including placement for those who seek employment. Each of the aforementioned agencies and their representatives are client-centered in that the services they provide should be oriented to meet the unique needs of each disadvantaged youth. In sparsely populated areas, adjustments would have to be made. Perhaps the concept of regional evaluation centers could be utilized.

- *Cooperative linkages should be formalized through interagency service agreements that contractually delineate the nature and extent of services to be provided to these disadvantaged youth by each participating agency.*

In order to bring the resources and services of each participating agency to bear on the unique individualized needs of disadvantaged youth, roles, responsibilities and commitments of each participating agency should be contractually specified in terms of interagency agreements. These agreements should specify the nature of the services to be provided and the performance standards to be applied in the contractual responsibilities of the participating agency. It is envisioned that these service agreements would vary in nature and scope across communities depending on the local community infrastructure. The fact that these interagency agreements must be negotiated at the local level would provide strong impetus for local coordination. Mandating the necessity to formalize a cooperative agreement but not specifying the content of coordination provides opportunity for the exercise of local initiative in designing an integrative system to serve the youth. Because local education agencies and prime sponsors have a joint responsibility for disadvantaged youth, they are jointly responsible for the formulation of an integrated interagency system bound by interagency agreements and serving disadvantaged youth. These interagency agreements commit the agencies to the ongoing provision of integrated services to disadvantaged youth and therefore tend to overcome the fragmenting effects of the project approach as presently practiced.

- *The Act should require that transitional services for disadvantaged youth be provided in accordance with a coordinated youth transitional services plan.*

This plan should present a complete description of the coordinated transition services to be provided to disadvantaged youth within a designated local service area. The plan should specify the needs of disadvantaged youth to be served, the range of transition services to be offered to meet these needs, the allocation of responsibilities for the offering of these transition services amongst the various local agencies involved, allocation of local, Federal and State financial resources to provide these transition services, and the reasons for choosing these transition services and corresponding financial allocations. The purpose of this plan is to promote the development of an integrative approach to the problems of disadvantaged youth that transcends agency boundaries and jurisdictions. In philosophy, these plans would be the outgrowth of a coordinative planning process reminiscent of the early CAMPS approach to manpower planning, but focused on the needs of disadvantaged youth.

The plan would require that agencies with separate funding cooperatively target their resources on the problems of disadvantaged youth. As envisioned, several major programs would be involved in this focused effort. Possible Federal funding sources to be coordinated could include Titles I, II, and III (Part F) of the Education Amendments Act of 1978 (P.L. 95-561), Title IV of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments of 1978 (P.L. 95-524), Education of the Handicapped (P.L. 94-142), Title II of the Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482), and the Wagner-Peyser Act. Separate legislation would undoubtedly require amendments to make them compatible with the intent of this recommendation. The nature and extent of the amendments will be touched upon in a later recommendation.

- *Responsibilities for the preparation of a coordinated youth transitional service plan at the local level should reside in a local coordinated youth transitional services council.*

This council should consist of representatives from both secondary and postsecondary education including vocational education, prime sponsor, disadvantaged youth, parents, employers, organized labor, local employment security, vocational rehabilitation, social services, community-based organizations and community economic development agencies. The rationale for this representation is that each agency and/or constituency has a significant stake in the development of youth to take their places in society as productive members. Economic development is included because of the critical necessity for coordination of human resources with economic development at the local level.

A coordinated youth transitional services plan, once developed, should be approved by the coordinated youth transitional service council. What constitutes approval is open to a variety of operational definitions. One such definition might be that approval would require that a majority of the council present vote for its adoption. Or, alternatively, that a majority of the prime sponsors and educational representatives vote for its adoption. The requirement that education and prime sponsors be in agreement as to the content of the plan is crucial since these agencies have joint responsibility for provision of transitional employment services to disadvantaged youth.

A coordinated youth transitional services plan should be prepared annually and should be derived from aggregates from individualized youth employability plans. Employability plans would provide the basis for the determination of transition services needed and would provide the rationale for determination of types of transition services required to satisfy individual needs. By linking the coordinated transitional services plan to the individualized services plan, greater assurance can be provided that the coordinated transitional service plan is addressed to the universe of needs as provided by the aggregate of the individualized service plans.

The coordinated youth transitional service plans should contain interagency agreements and be negotiated among the major service providers. These agreements, negotiated in the context of the coordinated youth transitional service plan, would represent an implicit sign-off of the major service providers as an indication of their willingness to be guided by and directed in accordance with the plan. Where applicable, the functions of the youth transitional services council could be subsumed by existing organizational structures.

- *The act should provide for the formulation of a coordinated youth transitional services council at the State level.*

A state coordinated youth transitional services council should consist of: a representative of the state agency having responsibility for secondary education programs; a representative of the state agency having responsibility for postsecondary education programs; a representative of the state agency having responsibility for juvenile justice; a representative of the state employment and training council; a representative of the state vocational rehabilitation agency; a representative of the state employment security agency; a representative of the agency having responsibility for statewide economic development; a representative of the state council on quality of education; and a representative of the state advisory council on vocational education.

This council should have responsibility for the review of local coordinated youth transitional services plans. The purpose of this review would be to determine the availability, responsiveness, and adequacy of the transition services provided statewide to disadvantaged youth. Results of their review would be presented as a series of recommendations presented in an annual report. This report on the status of youth transitional services would be submitted to the governor, the state board having jurisdiction over secondary education and the state board having jurisdiction over postsecondary education.

Local coordinated youth transitional service plans would serve as an integrated application for Federal funds under separate legislative authority. State level review and approval of local plans is provided for in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as amended, in the Education of the Handicapped Act as amended and in the Vocational Education Act as amended. Local coordinated youth transitional service plans could be reviewed by the separate state agencies with statutory authority to determine that the various assurances have been provided and that the plans are in compliance with the requirements of the various supportive legislation. Each state agency would be responsible for review and approval of that part of the coordinated youth transitional services plans pertaining to the Federal legislation which they are responsible for administering. As an example, exercise of the review and approval function would require a review of local coordinated youth transitional services plans by educational representatives responsible for compensatory education, basic skills improvement, and youth employment transition services provided under separate authority of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; a review by special education representation responsible for components funded under authority of the Education for the Handicapped Act; and a review of the vocational education activity proposed to be funded under the Vocational Education Act as amended. Employment and training council representatives would have responsibility for the review of that portion of the coordinated youth transitional employment services plans relating to the allocation of funds provided under CETA.

- *The state coordinated youth transitional services council should have responsibility for the development of a statewide youth transitional services plan.*

The statewide youth transitional services plan would set forth a policy planning and program framework that the State would follow in the provision of leadership, professional development, program supportive and improvement activities and administration and monitoring. Leadership could be defined to include those activities by which the State proposed to provide technical assistance, direction, and guidance to local service providers of transitional services to disadvantaged youth. The professional development activities should include a description of the policies, procedures, and means by which the State proposed to develop a cadre of professionals trained to provide services to disadvantaged youth. Program supportive and improvement activities are programmatic activities to be engaged in at the State level for the purpose of providing support to local program operations. This might well include research and development efforts aimed at improving the quality of transition services offered to disadvantaged youth, exemplary programs designed to test new approaches to the provision of improved transition services, curriculum development efforts oriented to the needs of disadvantaged youth, counseling guidance efforts with special attention to the provision of labor market and occupational information to facilitate career development, special efforts to overcome sex-role stereotyping and programs to deal with the special problems of pregnant teenagers. Administration and monitoring aspects of the plan should focus on the policies and procedures to be used to provide satisfactory assurances that the intent of the supportive Federal legislation would be met, that Federal funds would be used to supplement and where practical increase the level of state and local funding. Assurances should be included that the local plan will not result in duplication of services, that funds will be allocated to local recipients according to designated allocation formulas, and that accountability reports could be provided as required by the appropriate Federal agencies. This plan should also contain the assurances, policies, and procedures by which the state agencies propose to work together cooperatively to ensure an integrative approach to the provision of transition services.

- *State coordinated youth transitional service plans should be jointly submitted to the Department of Education and the Department of Labor for review and approval.*

Consistent with the joint responsibility for the provision of transition services to disadvantaged youth at the local level, joint responsibility should also be mirrored at the Federal level. This could be accomplished by the establishment of a joint review process in which the Departments of Education and Labor would have joint responsibility for reviewing the availability, responsiveness and adequacy of state responses to joint Federal youth initiatives. Each department would have unilateral responsibility through review of those portions of the state coordinated youth transitional services plan that pertained to services offered and financed by funds under that department's jurisdiction.

- *Financing of the integrative approach to provision of transitional employment services to disadvantaged youth would require amendments to existing Federal legislation.*

Financing a comprehensive approach to transitional employment services for disadvantaged youth would require amendments to perhaps four major pieces of Federal legislation. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 as amended could be altered in several ways. Titles I and II could be amended to contain provisions authorizing the use of funds for an integrative approach to provision of transition services for disadvantaged youth. A more direct way might be to expand the youth provisions of Title III. This expansion could be accomplished by elaborating upon the mechanisms by which educational services for disadvantaged youth could be coordinated across Federal programs. This alternative is particularly attractive because there is a separate appropriation authorized for youth employment. The Education for the Handicapped Act could be modified to authorize expenditures of funds for disadvantaged youth under the provisions of a coordinated youth transitional services plan. The Vocational Education Act could be amended by adding a new youth title with separate authorization. By so doing, Congress could designate service to disadvantaged youth as a national priority and could give direction to the transitional services to be provided through a listing of said services authorized for support under the Title. The Wagner-Peyser Act could be amended as necessary to provide employment security agencies the needed authority and appropriations to commit resources to an expanded provision of placement and job development services. In each piece of legislation amended, the planning and program framework for enabling local coordinated youth transitional service councils to develop plans for review at the State level should be set forth.

A consistent pattern of Federal funding should be established across all major authorizing Federal legislation. Federal matching requirements should be eliminated with the provision that Federal funds should be used only to pay for the entire excess costs involved in providing coordinated transition services to disadvantaged youth. Allowance of Federal funds to pay the excess costs of services would act as an incentive for the States to respond to Federal priority initiative. Federal funds should be allocated to States and to local agencies involved in provision of employability services to disadvantaged youth on the basis of a formula which contains an estimate of the universe of needs to be served. One such estimate of need might be the number of youth from families below the poverty level or some other equivalent measure of the number of disadvantaged youth to be served in a local service area. The definition of disadvantagement should be standardized across the enabling Federal legislation, thereby ensuring a more coordinated approach to the provision of youth transition and employment services. For purposes of simplicity, it is recommended that disadvantaged be defined on the basis of a financial criterion. By so doing, eligibility would be a function of the characteristic of the youth and would not be complicated by program performance requirements. The stipulation that disadvantaged youth should be mainstreamed to the extent possible should be deleted. Since many of the problems of disadvantaged youth stem from their association with the educational system, a requirement that they be mainstreamed if at all possible conflicts with the provision of alternative educational strategies for serving their needs in a more productive and satisfying manner.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD TAKE ALL POSSIBLE ACTION TO ENSURE THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A COORDINATIVE AND INTEGRATIVE APPROACH TO MEETING THE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF DISADVANTAGED YOUTH.

- *The Department should support the development of curriculum models that would assist local educational agencies in relating academic/general education to the career and job preparation needs of disadvantaged youth.*

Curriculum models need to be developed which will allow for a staged progression from awareness and exploration to the acquisition of job-specific skills and the development of expertise in job search procedures. These curriculum models would seek to superimpose the vocational emphasis of preparation for work onto a broad career education foundation emphasizing work as the unifying concept and development as the major theme. The previously identified OE occupational clusters could be used as the basis for the development of awareness and exploration. More specific occupational clusters could be devised based on the Standard Occupational Classification system. These curriculum models, once developed and disseminated, could serve as exemplary models guiding the development of local efforts to serve disadvantaged youth.

- *The latest state-of-the-art technology in career and job skills preparation should be documented and disseminated to local educational agencies.*

The state of the art in teaching job-specific skills to disadvantaged youth should be reviewed in an effort to determine what techniques and procedures work best for what disadvantaged groups. The latest advancements in learning theory, motivation, and use of incentives should be examined in an effort to determine what principles would be of greatest value in the design of curriculum materials to facilitate career development and job preparation of disadvantaged youth. The findings together with suggestions for applications should be disseminated to local and state educational agencies. In this manner, the Federal government could play a leadership role in stimulating new and improved methods for imparting career employability and job preparation skills to disadvantaged youth.

- *The Department should seek to identify, document, and promote the adoption of exemplary means of awarding academic credit for job experience.*

Substantial progress has yet to be made in the adoption of innovative procedures for translation of work experience to academic credit. Methods need to be developed for identifying competencies acquired through work experience, for determining the academic equivalent of these competencies and for assessing the extent to which the student has mastered these competencies. Barriers in terms of state laws, school policies, and attitudes should be identified and strategies developed for their alleviation.

- *Alternative strategies for the development of job skills as the capstone of a total career education program should be identified, the achievements evaluated, and the comparative results disseminated.*

Information on alternatives to conventional educational practices for imparting academic, transitional and job-specific skills to the disadvantaged should be comparatively analyzed as to their capabilities to meet the needs of a disadvantaged clientele. Strategies should be assessed in terms of competencies attained, impact achieved, resource costs, and their transportability to other locations.

- *Models for the assessment of the education and training needs of disadvantaged youth should be developed and the efficacy of their use in practice determined.*

Schools are frequently hindered by their lack of expertise in diagnosing the problems encountered by disadvantaged youth in negotiating the transition between education and work. An inventory and evaluation of available diagnostic methods would increase their expertise in identifying and prescribing transitional services to meet these needs.

- *The Department should seek to utilize the CETA coordinators in the States as a diffusion and change network through which improved practices could be disseminated to local education agencies and institutions.*

CETA coordinators in the States represent a ready-made network of contacts that could be easily transformed into an effective force for re-focusing educational effort on disadvantaged youth. CETA coordinators, with a history dating back to MDTA, could function as education change agents with responsibilities of developing coordinative mechanisms at the State level and could function as catalytic agents increasing state responsiveness to the problems of disadvantaged youth. CETA coordinators, backed by technical assistance from the Federal level, could develop an interstate communication network that would promote the rapid dissemination of practices and procedures that have been found to be effective in actual use.

- *The Department should mount an extensive educational and professional development effort to train educational professionals to deal more effectively with the transitional problems of disadvantaged youth.*

Educational professional development efforts should be directed at the teacher training institutions. Incentives should be provided for the development of courses oriented toward education-to-work problems experienced by disadvantaged youth. Particular attention should be paid to those learning strategies that have been proven to be effective in imparting skills to these populations, the particular learning problems experienced by youth and the conditions under which various learning options may be most effective. Emphasis on dealing with disadvantaged youth in teacher training programs would provide a cadre of trained professionals and should have societal payoff in terms of increased responsiveness of the educational system.

In addition to pre-service training in dealing with the problems of the disadvantaged, a network of in-service training resources should be identified and these resources and their availability made known to local and state education agencies and institutions. Regional centers could be established under contract to provide technical assistance including in-service training in much the same way that technical assistance contracts have been let for the provision of technical assistance and training under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR SHOULD ENGAGE IN A SERIES OF INTEGRATED EFFORTS TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY AND EFFICIENCY OF TRANSITIONAL SERVICES PROVIDED TO DISADVANTAGED YOUTH.

- *The Department should accelerate its program to provide consolidated employment services to disadvantaged youth.*

The lessons learned from the YEDPA experiment, if that experiment is to demonstrate its social effectiveness, must be distilled and the results put quickly into practice.

It would seem that the Consolidated Youth Employment Program is the ideal device for developing model programs to serve the disadvantaged based on the YEDPA experience. This model program should seek extended involvement of the community and should seek to achieve expanded coordination of the client-centered community service providers. It would seem that many of the procedures previously recommended could be incorporated into the model and disseminated to prime sponsors as a means of expanding their options in promoting an integrated service delivery approach to disadvantaged youth. The program should provide for a definitive role for local education agencies and should emphasize their responsibility for the education of all disadvantaged youth.

- *The Department should expand its technical assistance efforts and should concentrate its efforts on new and expanded ways of serving the disadvantaged youth.*

The YEDPA experiment provided an unprecedented pool of experience as to how to approach the problems of disadvantaged youth. Yet the social benefit of this experiment will go largely unnoticed unless these benefits can be translated into programmatic improvements. These programmatic improvements will require increased technical assistance to be provided to local prime sponsors. Provision of such technical assistance and training at the magnitude and intensity required to make a substantial impact will necessitate integration of national and regional offices into a working team. This will require both reallocation of technical assistance responsibilities, development of comprehensive policies, expansion of resources, and the training of personnel. Unless efforts are made to translate YEDPA lessons into operational pragmatics, YEDPA will leave but a legacy of empirical results that will have but passing academic interest.

- *Innovative practices funded under the 1 percent set-asides for coordination should be documented and a clearinghouse established for the dissemination of these approaches.*

States are currently searching for alternative coordination strategies to be considered for adoption. A review and synthesis of coordination alternatives would facilitate the effective use of coordination monies and would eliminate some of the uncertainties and slippages that the States are currently experiencing. Establishment of a clearinghouse for these practices would provide a useful service to the States and could enhance the leadership image of the Department.

- *A review and synthesis of the approaches to development of individualized employment and training plans should be undertaken.*

An examination of the practices and problems encountered in the development of individualized employability and training plans and recommendations for improved procedures to be used in their development would facilitate use by prime sponsors. Based on the assessment of current practice procedures, improvement of the individual planning process could be suggested. These procedures should build upon the accumulated experience of career education and in the preparation of individual education plans as required in the Education for the Handicapped Act. Provision for the inclusion of educational input into the development of employment and training plans should be made and suggested mechanisms for obtaining this coordinated input provided.

- *Technical assistance and training should be provided to prime sponsors and educators on means of improving their coordination of the delivery of services to disadvantaged youth.*

A series of technical assistance contracts should be awarded for the provision of technical assistance and training to promote the incidence of coordination and cooperation between prime sponsors and local education agencies and institutions with special emphasis on the inclusion of vocational education. Regional assistance centers should be established and these centers charged with the responsibility of providing group and individual assistance. Group assistance could be provided through an on-going series of workshops augmented by assistance on an individual basis. Individualized assistance could be provided by a series of teams of resource persons with expertise in the needs of disadvantaged youth and the design and evaluation of programs to serve these specific needs.

- *The Department should engage in a sustained effort to promote a competency-based approach to training of disadvantaged youth.*

The Department should seek to develop a compendium of competencies that could serve as the goals for inclusion in individualized employment and training plans. Competencies could be defined in terms of the performance requirements and the criteria measures to assess the attainment of these requirements. Available instructional materials and curricular resources could be reviewed and matched to these competencies. Description of assessment in terms of criterion-referenced measurements would facilitate assessment. The result would be a catalog of competencies matched with instructional materials that could be used to achieve these strategies and criterion references that could be used to measure the attainment of these competencies. This product should have utility for the prime sponsors in that it would provide guidance and direction in initiating a competency-based approach to the training of disadvantaged youth.

STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

THE STATES SHOULD MOVE TO DEVELOP A COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM FOR THE PROVISION OF EMPLOYMENT-TO-WORK TRANSITION SERVICES FOR DISADVANTAGED YOUTH.

- *The States should enact legislation that mandates the provision of free and appropriate education to disadvantaged youth as a State priority and appropriate the necessary resources to make this commitment a reality.*

State legislation should establish the mandate for provision of comprehensive education and employment training opportunities for disadvantaged youth. Legislation should mandate the relationships which must be established between all state agencies in order to provide a comprehensive and integrated approach. Goals and responsibilities of state agencies should be specified so as to provide a clear service mandate. Interagency linkage mechanisms should be established and their functions specified. Changes in state finance laws should be made as necessary to ensure that state funds will be targeted to the service of disadvantaged youth and assurances provided that the monies will be expended for the designated purposes.

- *The state administration should adopt policies that assign lead agency responsibility for provision of services to disadvantaged youth.*

By assigning responsibility for the provision of services to disadvantaged youth to specific state agencies, problems of turf-domain can be minimized and chances of duplication of services or contradiction of purposes minimized. Agencies assigned lead responsibility can delegate their responsibility but not their accountability. By making the responsibility and accountability a matter of public record, agencies have a greater incentive to actualize their mandate. Operation and coordination mandated by legislation and enforced through the sanction of administrative authority has a greater chance of achieving tangible results since the impetus for coordination resides in an external source.

- *State boards of education should review their policies and programs to ensure that educational programs are available to meet the education, employment, and training needs of all disadvantaged youth and that no disadvantaged youth are denied access to educational services because of their disadvantagements.*

State educational agencies should review their policies with respect to the provision of educational transitional services to the disadvantaged and should develop operational guidelines for implementation of these policies. Special attention should be given to development of policies that promote awarding of academic credit. These operational procedures should provide for the integration of all aspects of academic/general/special/vocational education. State educational agencies should move with vigor to ensure that these operational policies are enacted at the local level. The CETA coordinators should be assigned specific responsibilities for coordination with on-going statewide CETA activities and for working in close cooperation with the balance-of-state sponsor and other agencies in the provision of technical assistance to local education agencies and institutions regarding coordination with prime sponsors.

LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES AND PRIME SPONSORS

LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES AND PRIME SPONSORS SHOULD ENGAGE IN A SPIRIT OF MUTUAL COOPERATION AND COORDINATION DIRECTED TOWARD THE PROVISION OF IMPROVED EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES FOR DISADVANTAGED YOUTH.

The specifics of how this coordination will be achieved will depend upon the uniqueness of local situations. Procedures to be followed in initiating and maintaining coordination can, however, be suggested. The development of these procedures and guidelines are beyond the purpose of this report. The guidelines for coordination produced as a subsequent product of this project will address this purpose.

REFERENCES

Green, Ernest. Keynote Address to the 71st American Vocational Association Convention, Atlantic City, New Jersey, December, 1977 as reported in the *American Vocational Journal*, February, 1978, pp. 23-24.

Hansen, Lorraine S. *An Examination of the Definitions and Concepts of Career Education.* Washington, D. C.: National Advisory Council for Career Education, June, 1977.

Herr, Edwin L. *Review and Synthesis of Foundations for Career Education.* Information Series No. 61. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, ERIC Clearinghouse on Vocational and Technical Education, March, 1972.

Hoyt, Kenneth B. *Relationships Between Career Education and Vocational Education.* Monographs on Career Education. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

Mirengoff, William and Lester Rindler. *CETA: Manpower Programs Under Local Control.* Washington, D. C.: *National Academy of Sciences*, 1978.

National League of Cities, United States Conference of Mayors. *The Impact of CETA on Institutional Vocational Education.* Washington, D. C.: NLC and USCOM, 1976.

Snedeker, Bonnie B. and David M. Snedeker. *CETA: Decentralization on Trial.* Salt Lake City, UT: Olympus Publishing Company, 1978.

U. S. Congress. *Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments of 1978.* Public Law 95-524, enacted October 27, 1978. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1978.

U. S. Congress. *Education Amendments of 1976.* Public Law 94-482, enacted October 12, 1976. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

U. S. Congress. *Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977.* Enacted January 4, 1977. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, January, 1977.

U. S. Department of Labor. CETA Staff Evaluation Findings. Washington, D. C.: U. S. DOL, July, 1975.

U. S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration. Interchange, (August 1975) Vol. II, No. 7.

U. S. Department of Labor, Manpower Information Service. CETA Enrollees. Washington, D. C.: U. S. DOL, 1975.

U. S. Office of Education, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education. Unpublished manuscript. 1978.

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield, MA: G. & C. Merriam Company, 1979.